arXiv:1412.7040v2 [math.GR] 27 Dec 2015

CRYSTAL MONOIDS & CRYSTAL BASES: REWRITING SYSTEMS AND BIAUTOMATIC STRUCTURES FOR PLACTIC MONOIDS OF TYPES A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, AND G_2

ALAN J. CAIN, ROBERT D. GRAY, AND ANTÓNIO MALHEIRO

Abstract. The vertices of any (combinatorial) Kashiwara crystal graph carry a natural monoid structure given by identifying words labelling vertices that appear in the same position of isomorphic components of the crystal. We prove some foundational results for these crystal monoids, including the observation that they have decidable word problem when their weight monoid is a finite rank free abelian group. The problem of constructing finite complete rewriting systems, and biautomatic structures, for crystal monoids is then investigated. In the case of Kashiwara crystals of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2 (corresponding to the q-analogues of the Lie algebras of these types) these monoids are precisely the generalised plactic monoids investigated in work of Lecouvey. We construct presentations via finite complete rewriting systems for all of these types using a unified proof strategy that depends on Kashiwara's crystal bases and analogies of Young tableaux, and on Lecouvey's presentations for these monoids. As corollaries, we deduce that plactic monoids of these types have finite derivation type and satisfy the homological finiteness properties left and right FP_∞. These rewriting systems are then applied to show that plactic monoids of these types are biautomatic and thus have word problem soluble in quadratic time.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Crystals and plactic monoids 6

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 17B10; Secondary 05E10; 16S15; 16T30; 20M42; 20M05; 20M35; 68Q42; 68Q45; 68R15.

The first author was supported by an Investigador FCT fellowship (IF/01622/2013/CP1161/CT0001).

Much of the research leading to this paper was undertaken during visits by the second author to the Centro de Álgebra da Universidade de Lisboa and the Centro de Matemática e Aplicações, Universidade Nova de Lisboa. We thank both centres and universities for their hospitality. These visits were funded by the FCT project PEst-OE/MAT/UI0143/2014 (held by CAUL) and the FCT exploratory project IF/01622/2013/CP1161/CT0001 (attached to the first author's fellowship).

For the first and third authors, this work was partially supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology) through the project UID/MAT/00297/2013 (Centro de Matemática e Aplicações).

For the third author, this work was partially developed within the research activities of the Centro de Álgebra da Universidade de Lisboa, FCT project PEst-OE/MAT/UI0143/2014.

The authors thank Cédric Lecouvey for supplying offprints, Duarte Chambel Ribeiro for pointing out an error, and Vanda Martins for dealing with administrative matters arising from the second author's visits to Lisbon.

2.1. Notation 6
2.2. Definitions of crystal graph and crystal graph of type A_n 7
2.3. Weights 11
2.4. Relations from crystal graphs 12
2.5. Crystal graphs of types B_n, C_n, D_n and G_2 16
2.6. Properties of crystal graphs of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n and G_2 18
3. Strategy of proofs for rewriting systems 18
4. Tableaux and tabloids 19
4.1. Young tableaux and columns 19
4.2. Tabloids and tableaux 22
4.3. Presentations for plactic monoids 26
5. Two-column lemmata 27
5.1. A_n 28
5.2. C_n 31
5.3. B_n 36
5.4. D_n 41
5.5. G_2 51
6. Constructing the rewriting system 52
6.1. Preliminaries 53
6.2. Construction 53
7. Biautomaticity lemmata 56
7.1. Left-multiplication by transducer 56
7.2. Right-multiplication by transducer 64
8. Building the biautomatic structure 76
8.1. Preliminaries 76
8.2. Construction 77
References 79

1. Introduction

The Plactic monoid is a fundamental algebraic object which captures a natural monoid structure carried by the set of semistandard Young tableaux. It arose originally in the work of Schensted [Sch61] on algorithms for finding the maximal length of a nondecreasing subsequence of a given word over the ordered alphabet $\mathcal{A}_n = \{1 < 2 < \ldots < n\}$. The output of Schensted's algorithm is a tableau and, by identifying pairs of words that lead to the same tableau, one obtains the Plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$ of rank n. Following this, Knuth [Knu70] found a finite set of defining relations for the Plactic monoid. An in-depth systematic study of the Plactic monoid was then carried out in the work of Schützenberger [Sch77] and Lascoux and Schützenberger [LS81]. Since then, the Plactic monoid and its corresponding semigroup algebra, the Plactic algebra, have found applications in various aspects of representation theory and algebraic combinatorics. Schützenberger [Sch97] argues that the Plactic monoid ought to be considered as one of the fundamental monoids in algebra. He gives several reasons to support this claim, including the fact that the Plactic monoid was used to give the first correct proofs of the Littlewood–Richardson rule for products of Schur

functions by Schützenberger himself [Sch77] and independently by Thomas [Tho74, Tho78]. (For further details on the Littlewood–Richardson rule and the history of attempts to prove it, see [Lot02, Section 5.4], [Gre07, Appendix], [vL01, § 4], and [Sta99, Chapter 7, Appendix 1].)

Numerous other applications of the Plactic monoid have since been discovered including a combinatorial description of Kostka–Foulkes polynomials [LS81, LS78], a noncommutative version of the Demazure character formula, and of the Schubert polynomials [LS85, LS90]. The Plactic monoid has motivated a wide range of other interesting work including the discovery of variations on this monoid like the shifted [Ser10] and hypoplactic monoids [KT97], Littelmann's generalization to Plactic algebras for semisimple Lie algebras [Lit96], the investigation of the Chinese monoid [CEK$^+$01], Hilbert series (growth functions) [DK94], the conjugacy problem [CM15], homogeneous monoids and algebras which include monoids attached to set-theoretic solutions to Yang–Baxter equations [Okn14, JOVC15, CO12, Deh15b], semigroup identities [KO15], and the theory of quadratic normalization [Deh15a]. Some structural results for Plactic algebras were obtained in [CO04, KO12]. An excellent general introduction to the Plactic monoid is given in the article of Lascoux, Leclerc and Thibon [Lot02, Chapter 5].

One of the most exciting connections which has recently emerged are the links between the Plactic monoid and Kashiwara's crystal basis theory. This subject has its origins in the theory of quantum groups [HK02]. The notion of the quantised enveloping algebra, or quantum group, $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ associated with a symmetrisable Kac–Moody Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ was discovered independently by Drinfeld [Dri85] and Jimbo [Jim85] in 1985 while studying solutions of the quantum Yang–Baxter equations. Kashiwara [Kas90, Kas91] introduced crystals in order to give a combinatorial description of modules over $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ when q tends to zero. Crystals are extremely useful combinatorial tools for studying representations of these algebras. For example, knowing the crystal of a representation allows one to deduce tensor product and branching rules involving that representation. Since its introduction this important theory has been developed and generalised in multiple directions e.g. to quantum affine algebras, superalgebras and quantum queer superalgebras; see [Kan03, BKK00, GJK$^+$14, GJK$^+$15].

The connection with the Plactic monoid comes via the study of crystal bases of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$-modules. These type-A_n crystals have vertex set corresponding to all words over the alphabet $\mathcal{A}_n = \{1 < 2 < \ldots < n\}$, directed edges labelled by colours from the set $I = \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ which are determined by the Kashiwara operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$, and weights coming from the free abelian group $\mathbb{Z}^n$ given by word content (see Section 2.2 for full details of this construction). An isomorphism between two connected components of the crystal is a weight preserving bijection which maps edges to edges preserving colours. If one defines a relation by saying that two words are equivalent if there is an isomorphism between their respective connected components mapping one vertex to the other then it turns out that this relation on $\mathcal{A}_n^*$ is equal to the Plactic relation mentioned above. In this way, the Plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$ may be defined in terms of crystals of type A_n. There are a number of explicit constructions known for crystals of

representations of other quantum algebras. In addition to type A_n, explicit descriptions of crystals are known for simple Lie algebras of types B_n, C_n, D_n, and the exceptional type G_2; see [HK02, KM94, KN94, Lit95, Lec07]. For crystals of each of these types, aspects of theory have been developed. As part of their description of crystals of types A_n, B_n, C_n, and D_n, Kashiwara and Nakashima [KN94] develop the correct generalisation of semistandard tableaux for classical types via the notion of admissible column. For all of these types, Lecouvey obtained finite presentations via Knuth-type relations for the corresponding crystal monoids (as defined in Section 2.4 below), he also gives Schensted–type insertion algorithms and establishes a Robinson–Schensted type correspondence in all of these cases [Lec02, Lec03, Lec07]. Bumping and sliding algorithms for C_n-tableaux were also independently obtained by Baker [Bak00]. Analogous results for infinite rank quantum groups were given by Lecouvey in [Lec09].

In addition to shedding new light on the connection between the Plactic monoid and the representation theory of Lie algebras, this viewpoint also gives rise to a natural family of monoids arising from crystals, generalising the classical Plactic monoid. Following Kashiwara [Kas95] a crystal is an edge-coloured directed graph satisfying a certain simple set of axioms. As we shall see in Section 2.4 below, every abstract combinatorial crystal gives rise to a monoid, in the same way that the classical Plactic monoid arises from A_n above. Examples of Crystal monoids (with weights from a free abelian group) include the classical Plactic monoid $Pl(A_n)$, each of the Plactic-type monoids studied by Lecouvey in [Lec02, Lec03, Lec07], and also other important well-studied monoids such as the bicyclic monoid.

In more detail, as mentioned above, in the general abstract definition of combinatorial crystal (see Section 2.2 below for a full definition) the vertices correspond to words over a finite alphabet X, and weight-preserving isomorphisms between connected components define a congruence $\sim$ on the free monoid X^*. The corresponding crystal monoid is then the monoid $X^*/\sim$ obtained by factoring the free monoid by this congruence. This connects the theory of Kashiwara crystals directly to combinatorial semigroup theory (the study of semigroups defined by generators and relations), combinatorics on words, and formal language theory. For instance, Lecouvey's results [Lec02, Lec03, Lec07] show in particular that for all classical types, these crystal monoids $X^*/\sim$ are all finitely presented. Powerful tools exist for studying monoids defined by presentations in this way, including the theories of (Noetherian and confluent) string rewriting systems [BO93] and automata theory, specifically the theory of automatic groups and monoids [ECH$^+$92, CRRT01].

The defining property for automatic groups and monoids is the existence of a rational set of normal forms (with respect to some finite generating set A) such that we have, for each generator in A, a finite automaton that recognizes pairs of normal forms that differ by multiplication by that generator. It is a consequence of the definition that automatic monoids (and in particular automatic groups) have word problem that is solvable in quadratic time [CRRT01, Corollary 3.7]. Automatic groups have attracted a lot of attention over the last 25 years, in part because of the large number of

natural and important classes of groups that have this property. The class of automatic groups includes: various small cancellation groups [GS90], Artin groups of finite and large type [HR12], braid groups, and hyperbolic groups in the sense of Gromov [Gro87]. In parallel, the theory of automatic monoids has been extended and developed over recent years. Classes of monoids that have been shown to be automatic include divisibility monoids [Pic06], singular Artin monoids of finite type [CHKT11], and monoids arising from confluence monadic rewriting systems [OR01, Cai09]. Several complexity and decidability results for automatic monoids are obtained in [Loh05]. Other aspects of the theory of automatic monoids that have been investigated include connections with the theory of Dehn functions [Ott00] and complete rewriting systems [OSKM98].

In the cases that they are applicable, these tools of string rewriting systems and automatic structures give rise to algorithms for working with the monoids, which can in particular be used to study decidability and complexity questions. These are very natural aspects of theory to develop given the fundamental role that algorithms play in the theory of Plactic monoids, tableaux and Kashiwara crystals outlined above. Of course any results about the complexity of algorithms for working with these monoids (algorithms that operate on words) may be translated to results about algorithms for working with the corresponding tableaux and crystal graphs (see Section 8 for examples of this). It was precisely these kinds of ideas that motivated the current authors' paper [CGM15] on the classical Plactic monoid. It was pointed out by E. Zelmanov [during his plenary lecture at the international conference *Groups and Semigroups: Interactions and Computations* (Lisbon, 25–29 July 2011)] that since Schensted's algorithm can be used to show that the Plactic monoid has word problem that is solvable in quadratic time, it is natural to ask whether Plactic monoids are automatic. This is a natural question since (as mentioned above) all automatic monoids have word problem decidable in quadratic time. In [CGM15] we gave an affirmative answer to this question. We did this by first constructing a finite complete rewriting system for the Plactic monoid, with respect to the set of column generators. Beginning with this finite complete rewriting system, we then showed that for Plactic monoids finite, transducers may be constructed to perform left (respectively right) multiplication by a generator. We then applied this result to show that Plactic monoids of arbitrary finite rank are biautomatic (the strongest form of automaticity for monoids). Other consequences of these results include the fact that Plactic algebras of finite rank admit finite Gröbner–Shirshov bases, Plactic monoids of finite rank satisfy the homological finiteness property FP_∞, and the homological finiteness property FDT, and that Plactic algebras are automaton algebras in the sense of Ufnarovski; see [Ufn98] or more recently [Okn14].

From the point of view of crystals, these results say that string rewriting systems and transducers can be used to compute efficiently with crystals of type A_n. Our interest in this paper is to investigate the extent to which these tools can be applied to other Kashiwara crystals and crystal monoids. The results in this article will show that such tools can be successfully developed for all of the classical types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and for the exceptional

type G_2. As in the case of the classical Plactic monoid our results will also show that these monoids have finite derivation type and satisfy the homological finiteness properties left and right FP_∞, and that the corresponding semigroup algebras are automaton algebras and all admit finite Gröbner–Shirshov bases. In addition to these results, in this article we shall also prove several fundamental results which lay the foundations of the study of crystal monoids in general which will be the subject of future work.

In more detail, in this paper we deploy Kashiwara's crystal bases to construct finite complete rewriting systems presenting Plactic monoids of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2. We take a unified approach that treats every type in the same way. We use column generators and our rewriting system has rules that (loosely speaking) replace an adjacent pair of columns by the unique tableau that represents their product. The key is to use crystal basis theory to analyze the shape of these tableaux by examining the corresponding highest-weight tableaux; this allows us to prove that the rewriting system is noetherian. These 'two-column lemmata' (see Section 5) are where we have to vary our approach between the various types of Plactic monoid.

Equipped with our finite complete rewriting systems, we then proceed to prove that Plactic monoids of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2 are biautomatic. Again we make use of crystal basis theory to analyze, in the highest-weight case, the rewriting that occurs after multiplication of a normal form word by a single generator. This allows us to prove that this rewriting can always be carried out by a finite-state automaton.

Note that we recover, using this new approach, our previous results that classical Plactic monoids (of type A_n) can be presented by finite complete rewriting systems and are biautomatic [CGM15]. Indeed, the rewriting system we obtain here in the A_n case coincides with the one obtained before. However, the proof here is radically different from our earlier work, which relied entirely on the combinatorial properties of Young tableaux and made no mention of crystal basis theory.

While writing this paper, we came across the work of Hage [Hag15], who independently constructed a finite complete rewriting system for $\mathrm{Pl}(C_n)$. Hage's approach differs from ours in making use of Lecouvey's insertion algorithms, whereas we use Lecouvey's presentations. (Hage does not consider biautomaticity or its consequences.)

2. Crystals and plactic monoids

In this section we will formulate the main concepts that are used throughout the paper. We will give a combinatorial description of the different types of plactic monoids and present Kashiwara's characterization of plactic monoids in terms of crystal graphs. We first consider the type A_n, then develop the general theory, then return to present the remaining cases B_n, C_n, D_n and G_2. For more details, see [Lec02, Lec03, Lec07]. As far as possible, our exposition is purely combinatorial and avoids delving into the deep theory underlying crystal graphs. We refer the reader to [HK02] for a detailed account of this theory.

2.1. **Notation.** We denote the empty word (over any alphabet) by ε. For an alphabet X, we denote by X^* the set of all words over X including the

empty word ε. When X is a generating set for a monoid M, every element of X^* can be interpreted either as a word or as an element of M. For words $u, v \in X^*$, we write $u = v$ to indicate that u and v are equal as words and $u =_X v$ to denote that u and v represent the same element of the monoid M. The length of $u \in X^*$ is denoted $|u|$, and, for any $x \in X$, the number of occurences of the symbol x in u is denoted $|u|_x$.

2.2. **Definitions of crystal graph and crystal graph of type A_n.** For the purposes of this paper, a directed graph with labels from I is a set V of vertices equipped with a set E of triples drawn from $V \times I \times V$. A triple $(v, i, v') \in E$ is interpreted as an edge from the vertex v to a vertex v' with label i. A path starting at $u \in V$ and ending at $w \in V$ is a (possibly empty) sequence of edges (u, i_0, v_1), (v_1, i_1, v_2), $\ldots$, (v_n, i_n, w); note that all paths are directed. Notice that vertices and edges may appear multiple times on a path.

For our purposes, a *crystal basis* is a directed labelled graph with vertex set X and label set I satisfying the conditions:

(1) For all $x \in X$ and $i \in I$, there is at most one edge starting at x labelled by i and at most one edge ending at x labelled by i.
(2) For all $i \in I$, there is no infinite path made up of edges labelled by i.

(Notice that the second condition implies that a crystal basis cannot contain an i-labelled directed circuit.)

(Strictly speaking, such a graph is a graphical description of the representation-theoretic notion of a crystal basis; see [HK02, § 4.2] for details. More precisely, every (integrable highest weight) representation of a symmetrizable Kac–Moody algebra has a crystal associated to it. However, not every crystal arises from such a representation. Indeed, there has been research on finding a simple set of local axioms that characterize those crystals that arise from such representations; see [Ste03]. In fact, the two conditions above coincide with axioms (P1) and (P2) in the characterization of the crystal graphs of integrable highest-weight modules for simply-laced quantum Kac–Moody algebras in [Ste03].)

For each $i \in I$, define partial maps $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ called the *Kashiwara operators* on the set X as follows: for each edge (a, i, b), which we will represent graphically as

$$a \xrightarrow{\ i\ } b\ ,$$

define $\tilde{f}_i(a) = b$ and $\tilde{e}_i(b) = a$.

We illustrate these definitions using a running example, which will eventually yield the 'crystal graph of type A_n'. For a natural number n, define the ordered alphabet

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \{1 < 2 < \ldots < n\},$$

and consider the following crystal basis:

$$1 \xrightarrow{\ 1\ } 2 \xrightarrow{\ 2\ } \ldots \xrightarrow{\ n-2\ } n-1 \xrightarrow{\ n-1\ } n\ , \tag{2.1}$$

This graph has vertex set $\mathcal{A}_n$ and labels from the set $\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$. From this graph, we have, for example, $\tilde{e}_1(2) = 1$ and $\tilde{f}_2(2) = 3$. Note that $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ are only partially defined: for example, $\tilde{e}_1(3)$ is undefined.

Using the definition of $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$, we can build an extended directed labelled graph, called the *crystal graph* arising from the given crystal basis. The vertex set is the free monoid X^* on X. The edges will be defined by partially extending the operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ to X^*, as follows: for all $u, v \in X^*$ and $i \in I$, define inductively

$$\tilde{e}_i(uv) = \begin{cases} u\,\tilde{e}_i(v) & \text{if } \varphi_i(u) < \epsilon_i(v) \\ \tilde{e}_i(u)\,v & \text{if } \varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v) \end{cases}; \tag{2.2}$$

$$\tilde{f}_i(uv) = \begin{cases} \tilde{f}_i(u)\,v & \text{if } \varphi_i(u) > \epsilon_i(v) \\ u\,\tilde{f}_i(v) & \text{if } \varphi_i(u) \leq \epsilon_i(v) \end{cases}, \tag{2.3}$$

where ϵ_i and φ_i are auxiliary maps on X^* defined as follows: for $w \in X^*$, let

$$\epsilon_i(w) = \max\bigl\{\, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : \underbrace{\tilde{e}_i \cdots \tilde{e}_i}_{k \text{ times}}(w) \text{ is defined} \,\bigr\};$$

$$\varphi_i(w) = \max\bigl\{\, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : \underbrace{\tilde{f}_i \cdots \tilde{f}_i}_{k \text{ times}}(w) \text{ is defined} \,\bigr\}.$$

Notice that the definition is not circular: the definitions of $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ depend, via ϵ_i and φ_i, only on $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ applied to *strictly shorter* words; the recursion terminates with $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ applied to single symbols from the alphabet X, which we defined from the crystal basis (in our running example, the graph (2.1)). However, it is not immediately clear that the actions of $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ are well-defined: in calculating $\tilde{e}_i(w)$ for some $w \in X^*$, it is conceivable that the result could depend on the chosen factorizations of w as uv. Actually, for crystals that arise from representations of quantum Kac–Moody algebras, the operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ are well-defined. Here, in order to develop the theory of crystal monoids in full generality we shall, after stating some necessary definitions, give a purely combinatorial proof verifying that these operators are well-defined.

We first define, for each $i \in I$, a map $\rho_i : X^* \to \{\, -^p+^q : p, q \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \,\}$. (Note that the symbols $+$ and $-$ here, and in the following discussion, are simply letters in the alphabet $\{+, -\}$.) For a word $w \in X^*$, define $\rho_i(w)$ to be the word obtained by replacing each symbol x of w by $-^{\epsilon_i(x)}+^{\varphi_i(x)}$, then iteratively deleting subwords $+-$ until a word of the form $-^p+^q$ remains. (These maps ρ_i are well-defined because $\bigl(\{+, -\}, \{+- \to \varepsilon\}\bigr)$ is a complete rewriting system; see Section 6.1 for background on rewriting systems. The maps ρ_i can be viewed as homomorphisms from X^* to the bicyclic monoid, which is presented by $\langle +, - \,|\, (+-, \varepsilon)\rangle$; see [Gri95, § I.6] for background on semigroup presentations and the bicyclic monoid.)

Note further that each symbol $+$ or $-$ in the computed word $\rho_i(w)$ is a symbol that 'survives' from the original replacement of symbols x by $-^{\epsilon_i(x)}+^{\varphi_i(x)}$. Furthermore, each symbol $+$ or $-$ in $\rho_i(w)$ is contributed by a uniquely determined symbol of w (since two subwords $+-$ cannot partially overlap with each other).

The following result shows the connection between ρ_i and the action of the operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$. The reader may wish to look forward to the computation of ρ_i in Example 2.2 to see how this result is applied.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $w = w_1 \cdots w_k$, where $w_h \in X$, and $i \in I$. Then*

(1) (a) *$\tilde{e}_i(w)$ is defined if and only if $\rho_i(w)$ contains at least one symbol $-$.*
   (b) *If $\tilde{e}_i(w)$ is defined, $\tilde{e}_i(w) = w_1 \cdots w_{j-1}\tilde{e}_i(w_j)w_{j+1}\cdots w_k$, where w_j is the symbol that contributed the rightmost symbol $-$ in $\rho_i(w)$.*
   (c) *If $\tilde{e}_i(w)$ is defined, $w = \tilde{f}_i(\tilde{e}_i(w))$.*

(2) (a) *$\tilde{f}_i(w)$ is defined if and only if $\rho_i(w)$ contains at least one symbol $+$.*
   (b) *If $\tilde{f}_i(w)$ is defined, $\tilde{f}_i(w) = w_1 \cdots w_{j-1}\tilde{f}_i(w_j)w_{j+1}\cdots w_k$, where w_j is the symbol that contributed the leftmost symbol $+$ in $\rho_i(w)$.*
   (c) *If $\tilde{f}_i(w)$ is defined, $w = \tilde{e}_i(\tilde{f}_i(w))$.*

(3) *$\rho_i(w) = -^{\epsilon_i(w)}+^{\varphi_i(w)}$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $|w|$. For $|w| = 1$ (that is, $w \in X$), the three parts are immediately consequences of the definitions of $\tilde{e}_i$, $\tilde{f}_i$, ϵ_i, φ_i, and ρ_i from the crystal basis.

So let $|w| > 1$ and suppose parts 1 to 3 hold for words that are strictly shorter than w. Choose a factorization of w as uv, where both u and v are shorter than w. (So neither u nor v is the empty word.) By the induction hypothesis, $\rho_i(u) = -^{\epsilon_i(u)}+^{\varphi_i(u)}$ and $\rho_i(v) = -^{\epsilon_i(v)}+^{\varphi_i(v)}$. So, by the definition of ρ_i, we can compute the word $\rho_i(w)$ by computing $\rho_i(u)\rho_i(v)$ and deleting subwords $+-$ until we obtain a word of the desired form. There are two possible cases to consider:

- Suppose $\varphi_i(u) < \epsilon_i(v)$. Then when we delete subwords $+-$ from $-^{\epsilon_i(u)}+^{\varphi_i(u)}-^{\epsilon_i(v)}+^{\varphi_i(v)}$, all of the left block of symbols $+$ are removed, and at least one symbol from the right block of symbols $-$ survives. So the resulting word contains at least one symbol $-$, and the rightmost symbol $-$ was contributed by some symbol in v. By definition, $\tilde{e}_i(uv) = u\tilde{e}_i(v)$. Notice that $\epsilon_i(v) > 0$ and so $\tilde{e}_i$ is defined. That is, $\tilde{e}_i$ acts on some symbol in the right factor v. By the induction hypothesis, $\tilde{e}_i$ acts on the symbol of v that contributed the rightmost symbol $-$ to $\rho_i(v)$, which, as we have just seen, must be the symbol of uv that contributed the rightmost symbol $-$ to $\rho_i(uv)$.
- Suppose $\varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v)$. Then when we delete subwords $+-$ from $-^{\epsilon_i(u)}+^{\varphi_i(u)}-^{\epsilon_i(v)}+^{\varphi_i(v)}$, all of the right block of symbols $-$ are removed. Thus the symbols $-$ that remain are precisely the $\epsilon_i(u)$ symbols $-$ that were contributed by symbols in u.

  Since $\tilde{e}_i(uv) = \tilde{e}_i(u)w$ by definition, it follows that $\tilde{e}_i(uv)$ is defined if and only if $\tilde{e}_i(u)$ is defined if and only if $\epsilon_i(u) > 0$ if and only if there is at least one symbol $-$ in $\rho_i(u)$. In this case, $\tilde{e}_i$ applies to the first factor u, and so, by the induction hypothesis, $\tilde{e}_i$ acts on the symbol of u that contributed the rightmost symbol $-$ to $\rho_i(u)$, which, as we have just seen, must be the symbol of uv that contributed the rightmost symbol $-$ to $\rho_i(uv)$.

This proves parts 1(a) and 1(b) for w. Similar reasoning proves parts 2(a) and 2(b) for w.

Suppose $\tilde{e}_i(w)$ is defined, so that part 1(b) applies. Note that the symbol $\tilde{e}_i(w_j)$ contributes the leftmost symbol $+$ to $\rho_i(\tilde{e}_i(w))$, because $\rho_i(\tilde{e}_i(w_j))$ contains at least one symbol $+$ since $\varphi_i(\tilde{e}_i(w_j)) = \varphi_i(w_j)+1$ by the definition of φ_i from the crystal basis. Hence, when applying $\tilde{f}_i$ to $\tilde{e}_i(w)$, the operator acts on the symbol $\tilde{e}_i(w_j)$. Since $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ are mutually inverse (when defined) on the alphabet X, it follows that $\tilde{f}_i(\tilde{e}_i(w)) = w$. Similar reasoning shows that $\tilde{e}_i(\tilde{f}_i(w)) = w$. This proves part 1(c) for w. Similar reasoning proves part 2(c) for w.

Consider the maximum value of k for which $\tilde{e}_i^k(uv)$ is defined. If $\varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v)$, then the operator acts on the first factor u, and this action is defined $\epsilon_i(u)$ times. Applications of $\tilde{e}_i$ to u do not affect whether the inequality $\varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v)$ holds, so if the operator applies to the first factor u, it does not subsequently apply to the second factor v. Thus, if $\varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v)$, then $\epsilon_i(uv) = \epsilon_i(u)$. On the other hand, if $\varphi_i(u) < \epsilon_i(v)$, then the operator acts on the second factor v. Each such application reduces the ϵ_i-image of the second factor, so this happens $\epsilon_i(v)-\varphi_i(u)$ times before the operator acts on the first factor u, and, as already shown, this action is defined for $\epsilon_i(u)$ times. Hence, if $\varphi_i(u) < \epsilon_i(v)$, then the maximum k for which $\tilde{e}_i^k(uv)$ is defined is $\epsilon_i(u)+\epsilon_i(v)-\varphi_i(u)$. Thus, if $\varphi_i(u) < \epsilon_i(v)$, then $\epsilon_i(uv) = \epsilon_i(u)+\epsilon_i(v)-\varphi_i(u)$.

Similar reasoning shows that if $\varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v)$, then $\varphi_i(uv) = \varphi_i(v)$, and that if $\varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v)$, then $\varphi_i(uv) = \varphi_i(u) - \epsilon_i(v) + \varphi_i(v)$. Hence $\rho_i(uv)$ is:

$$\begin{cases} -^{\epsilon_i(u)-\varphi_i(u)+\epsilon_i(v)}+^{\varphi_i(v)} & \text{if } \varphi_i(u) < \epsilon_i(v), \\ -^{\epsilon_i(u)}+^{\varphi_i(u)-\epsilon_i(v)+\varphi_i(v)} & \text{if } \varphi_i(u) \geq \epsilon_i(v). \end{cases}$$

which proves part 3. □

It is immediate from Proposition 2.1 that the actions of the operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ are well-defined. Furthermore, Proposition 2.1 gives the following practical method, first described in [KN94], for computing the actions of $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ on a word $w \in X^*$: Compute $\rho_i(w)$ by writing down the word obtained by replacing each symbol x by $-^{\epsilon_i(x)}+^{\varphi_i(x)}$ and then deleting subwords $+-$. The resulting word will have the form $-^{\epsilon_i(w)}+^{\varphi_i(w)}$. If $\epsilon_i(w) = 0$, then $\tilde{e}_i(w)$ is undefined. If $\epsilon_i(w) > 0$ then we obtain $\tilde{e}_i(w)$ by taking the symbol x that contributed the rightmost $-$ of $\rho_i(w)$ and changing it to $\tilde{e}_i(x)$. If $\varphi_i(w) = 0$, then $\tilde{f}_i(w)$ is undefined. If $\varphi_i(w) > 0$ the we obtain $f_i(w)$ by taking the symbol x that contributed the leftmost $+$ of $\rho_i(w)$ and changing it to $\tilde{f}_i(x)$.

Example 2.2. Let $w = 12231233112232 \in \mathcal{A}_3^*$. Let us compute $\tilde{e}_2(w)$ and $\tilde{f}_2(w)$ using the above method:

1	2	2	3	1	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	(the word w)
	+	+	−		+	−	−			+	+	−	+	(replacing each x by $-^{\epsilon_i(x)}+^{\varphi_i(x)}$)
	+					−				+		+		(deleting subwords $+-$)
										+		+		(deleting subword $+-$)

So $\rho_2(w) = ++$, and so $\epsilon_2(w) = 0$ and $\varphi_2(w) = 2$. So $\tilde{e}_2(w)$ is undefined, and $\tilde{f}_2(w)$ is obtained by taking the symbol 2 above the leftmost remaining $+$ and changing it to $\tilde{f}_2(2) = 3$. That is, $f_2(w) = 12231233113232$.

Notice in particular that if, during the deletion of subwords $+-$, the word that we obtain begins with $-$, then this symbol $-$ will remain in place throughout all subsequent deletions, and so $\epsilon_i(w) > 0$, and so $\tilde{e}_i(w)$ is defined. This observation is important, and we will use it repeatedly throughout the paper. (There is a dual observation for words ending in $+$ implying that $\tilde{f}_i(w)$ is defined, but we will not need this.)

In the crystal graph, we have an edge from w to w' labelled by i if and only if $w' = \tilde{f}_i(w)$ (or, equivalently, $w = \tilde{e}_i(w')$). Note that $\epsilon_i(u)$ is the length of the longest path consisting of edges labelled by i that ends at u. Dually, $\varphi_i(u)$ is the length of the longest path consisting of edges labelled by i that starts at u.

Returning to the running example, the crystal graph arising from the crystal basis (2.1), which has vertex set $\mathcal{A}_n^*$, is called the *crystal graph of type* A_n and is denoted Γ_{A_n}. Part of Γ_{A_3} is shown in Figure 1. Note that the length 1 words form a connected component that is exactly the original directed labelled graph (2.1).

2.3. **Weights.** A *weight function* is (in our abstract combinatorial setting) a homomorphism $\mathrm{wt} : X^* \to P$, where P is some monoid (called the *weight monoid*) such that there is a partial order $\leq$ on P (not necessarily compatible with multiplication in P) with the following property: for all $u \in X^*$ and $i \in I$, if $\tilde{e}_i(u)$ is defined, then $\mathrm{wt}(u) < \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{e}_i(u)\big)$, and if $\tilde{f}_i(u)$ is defined, then $\mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{f}_i(u)\big) < u$.

Let $u, v \in X^*$. The word u has *higher weight* than the word v (or, equivalently, the word v has *lower weight* than the word u) if $\mathrm{wt}(v) < \mathrm{wt}(u)$. Thus the operators $\tilde{e}_i$, when defined, always yield a word of higher weight, and the operators $\tilde{f}_i$, when defined, always yield a word of lower weight.

In the case of our running example, let P be $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and define $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{A}_n^* \to \mathbb{Z}^n$ to be the homomorphism extending the map

$$\mathrm{wt}(a) = (\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0}_{a\text{-th component is } 1}) \qquad \text{for } a \in \mathcal{A}_n.$$

In this example, the order on $\mathbb{Z}^n$ is defined by:

$$(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \leq (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n) \iff (\forall k)\Big(\sum_{i<k} \alpha_i \leq \sum_{i<k} \beta_i\Big).$$

In the remainder of the paper, we will not need to explicitly compare orders: we simply use the fact that $\tilde{e}_i$, when defined, raise weight, and $\tilde{f}_i$, when defined, lowers weight.

The abstract definitions of weight monoid and weight functions given here are more general than in the literature. Usually the weight monoid P is a free abelian group; actually, the weight monoids of the specific crystal graphs we consider in this paper are all of this type.

In the crystal graph Γ_X, a vertex that has maximal weight within a particular component is called a *highest-weight vertex*. (In the specific crystal



FIGURE 1. Part of the crystal graph of type A_3. Notice that the empty word ε and the word 123 are isolated vertices. Note also that the length 1 words form a connected component that is exactly the original crystal basis (2.1).

graphs we consider later, it will turn out that each component contains a *unique* highest-weight vertex.)

The following result, stated by Lecouvey [Lec07, Lemma 5.3.1] for a particular crystal monoid, is a direct consequence of the definitions of $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ in (2.2) and (2.3):

Lemma 2.3. *For any words $w_1, w_2 \in X^*$, the word $w_1 w_2$ is a vertex of highest weight of a connected component of the crystal graph Γ_X if and only if:*

(1) *w_1 is a vertex of highest weight (that is, $\epsilon_i(w_1) = 0$);*
(2) *for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have $\epsilon_i(w_2) \leq \varphi_i(w_1)$.*

2.4. **Relations from crystal graphs.** For any word $w \in X^*$, let $B(w)$ be the connected component of the crystal graph containing the vertex w. A *crystal isomorphism* is a bijection φ between two connected components $B(w)$ and $B(w')$ that maps directed edges labelled by i to directed edges labelled by i (in the sense that if (x, i, y) is an edge in $B(w)$, then $(\varphi(x), i, \varphi(y))$

is an edge in $B(w')$), sends non-edges to non-edges, and preserves weights (in the sense that $\mathrm{wt}(u) = \mathrm{wt}(\varphi(u))$ for any $u \in B(w)$). If there is a crystal isomorphism between $B(w)$ and $B(w')$, we say that $B(w)$ and $B(w')$ are isomorphic.

We say $u \in B(w)$ and $v \in B(w')$ lie in the *same position* of isomorphic components $B(w)$ and $B(w')$ if there is an isomorphism between $B(w)$ and $B(w')$ that maps u to u'; this is denoted by $u \sim v$. We now aim to show that this relation $\sim$ is a congruence on the monoid X^* (Proposition 2.6 below). For this we require the following two technical lemmata:

Lemma 2.4. *Let $u, v, u', v' \in X^*$. Suppose $u \sim v$ and $u' \sim v'$, and let $\theta' : B(u) \to B(v)$ and $\theta : B(u') \to B(v')$ be crystal isomorphisms such that $\theta(u) = v$ and $\theta'(u') = v'$. Let $i \in I$. Then:*

(1) *$\tilde{e}_i(uu')$ is defined if and only if $\tilde{e}_i(vv')$ is defined. If both are defined, exactly one of the following statements holds:*
   (a) *$\tilde{e}_i(uu') = u\tilde{e}_i(u')$ and $\tilde{e}_i(vv') = v\tilde{e}_i(v')$;*
   (b) *$\tilde{e}_i(uu') = \tilde{e}_i(u)u'$ and $\tilde{e}_i(vv') = \tilde{e}_i(v)v'$.*

(2) *$\tilde{f}_i(uu')$ is defined if and only if $\tilde{f}_i(vv')$ is defined. If both are defined, exactly one of the following statements holds:*
   (a) *$\tilde{f}_i(uu') = u\tilde{f}_i(u')$ and $\tilde{f}_i(vv') = v\tilde{f}_i(v')$;*
   (b) *$\tilde{f}_i(uu') = \tilde{f}_i(u)u'$ and $\tilde{f}_i(vv') = \tilde{f}_i(v)v'$.*

Proof. Since θ and θ' are crystal isomorphisms,

$$\epsilon_i(u) = \epsilon_i(v), \;\; \varphi_i(u) = \varphi_i(v), \;\; \epsilon_i(u') = \epsilon_i(v'), \;\; \text{and} \;\; \varphi_i(u') = \varphi_i(v').$$

The result now follows directly from the definitions of $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let $u, v, u', v' \in X^*$. Suppose $u \sim v$ and $u' \sim v'$, and let $\theta : B(u) \to B(v)$ and $\theta' : B(u') \to B(v')$ be crystal isomorphisms such that $\theta(u) = v$ and $\theta'(u') = v'$. Let $\tilde{g}_{i_1}, \ldots, \tilde{g}_{i_r}$ be a sequence of operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$. Then:*

(1) *$\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu')$ is defined if and only if $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(vv')$ is defined.*
(2) *When both $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu')$ and $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(vv')$ are defined, the sequence $\tilde{g}_{i_1}, \ldots, \tilde{g}_{i_r}$ may be partitioned in a unique way into two subsequences $\tilde{g}_{j_1}, \ldots, \tilde{g}_{j_s}$ and $\tilde{g}_{k_1}, \ldots, \tilde{g}_{k_t}$ such that*

$$\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu') = \tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(u)\tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(u'),$$
$$\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(vv') = \tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(v)\tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(v');$$

where

$$\theta\big(\tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(u)\big) = \tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(v),$$
$$\theta\big(\tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(u')\big) = \tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(v').$$

Proof. This result follows by iterated application of Lemma 2.4. □

Proposition 2.6. *The relation $\sim$ is a congruence on the free monoid X^*.*

Proof. It is clear from the definition that $\sim$ is an equivalence relation; it thus remains to prove that $\sim$ is compatible with multiplication in X^*.

Let $u, v, u', v' \in X^*$. Suppose $u \sim v$ and $u' \sim v'$. Then there exist crystal isomorphisms $\theta : B(u) \to B(v)$ and $\theta' : B(u') \to B(v')$ such that $\theta(u) = v$ and $\theta'(u') = v'$.

Define a map $\Theta : B(uu') \to B(vv')$ as follows. For $w \in B(uu')$, choose a sequence $\tilde{g}_{i_1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{i_r}$ of operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ such that $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu') = w$; such a sequence exists because w lies in the connected component $B(uu')$. Define $\Theta(w)$ to be $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(vv')$; note that this is defined by Lemma 2.5(a).

It is necessary to prove that Θ is well-defined. Suppose that $\tilde{g}_{\hat{i_1}}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_n}}$ is a sequence of operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ such that $\tilde{g}_{\hat{i_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_n}}(uu') = w$, and let $z = \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_n}}(vv')$. Note that by Lemma 2.5(b),

- the sequence $\tilde{g}_{i_1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{i_r}$ partitions into two subsequences $\tilde{g}_{j_1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{j_s}$ and $\tilde{g}_{k_1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{k_t}$ such that

$$\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu') = \tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(u)\tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(u');$$

- the sequence $\tilde{g}_{\hat{i_1}}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_n}}$ partitions into two subsequences $\tilde{g}_{\hat{j_1}}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_p}}$ and $\tilde{g}_{\hat{k_1}}, \dots, \tilde{g}_{\hat{k_q}}$ such that

$$\tilde{g}_{\hat{i_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_n}}(uu') = \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_p}}(u)\tilde{g}_{\hat{k_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{k_q}}(u').$$

Since both $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu')$ and $\tilde{g}_{\hat{i_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_n}}(uu')$ equal w, and since $\tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(u)$ and $\tilde{g}_{\hat{j_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_p}}(u)$ have length $|u|$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(u) &= \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_p}}(u); \\ \tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(u') &= \tilde{g}_{\hat{k_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{k_q}}(u'). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(w) &= \tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(vv') && \text{[by definition]} \\ &= \tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(v)\tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(v') && \text{[by Lemma 2.5]} \\ &= \theta\big(\tilde{g}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_s}(u)\big)\theta'\big(\tilde{g}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{k_t}(u')\big) \\ &= \theta\big(\tilde{g}_{\hat{j_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_p}}(u)\big)\theta'\big(\tilde{g}_{\hat{k_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{k_q}}(u')\big) && \text{[by (2.4)]} \\ &= \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{j_p}}(v)\tilde{g}_{\hat{k_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{k_q}}(v') \\ &= \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_1}} \cdots \tilde{g}_{\hat{i_n}}(vv') \\ &= z. \end{aligned}$$

So Θ is well-defined.

By Lemma 2.5(a), Θ and its inverse preserve labelled edges. To see that Θ preserves weight, proceed as follows. Since θ and θ' are crystal isomorphisms, $\mathrm{wt}(u) = \mathrm{wt}(v)$ and $\mathrm{wt}(u') = \mathrm{wt}(v')$. Since wt is a homomorphism, $\mathrm{wt}(uu') = \mathrm{wt}(vv')$. Therefore if $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu')$ and $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_r}(vv')$ are both defined, then

both sequences partition as in Lemma 2.5(b), and so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{wt}(w)\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{i_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{i_r}(uu')\big)\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{j_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{j_s}(u)\tilde{g}_{k_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{k_t}(u')\big)\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{j_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{j_s}(u)\big)\mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{k_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{k_t}(u')\big)\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\theta(\tilde{g}_{j_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{j_s}(u))\big)\mathrm{wt}\big(\theta'(\tilde{g}_{k_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{k_t}(u'))\big)\\
&\qquad\text{[since } \theta \text{ and } \theta' \text{ preserve weights]}\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{j_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{j_s}(\theta(u))\big)\mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{k_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{k_t}(\theta'(u'))\big)\\
&\qquad\text{[since } \theta \text{ and } \theta' \text{ are crystal isomorphisms]}\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{j_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{j_s}(v)\big)\mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{k_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{k_t}(v')\big)\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{j_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{j_s}(v)\tilde{g}_{k_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{k_t}(v')\big)\\
&= \mathrm{wt}\big(\tilde{g}_{i_1}\cdots\tilde{g}_{i_r}(vv')\big)\\
&= \mathrm{wt}(\Theta(w)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus Θ is a crystal isomorphism. Hence $uu' \sim vv'$. Therefore the relation $\sim$ is a congruence. □

Definition 2.7. Let X be an alphabet forming the vertex set of a crystal basis, $\mathrm{wt} : X^* \to P$ a weight function, and $\sim$ the congruence on X^* that relates two words if they lie in the same position of isomorphic components of the crystal graph Γ_X. Then we call $X^*/\!\sim$ the *crystal monoid* determined by the crystal Γ_X with weight function wt and weight monoid P.

In our running example, the crystal monoid we obtain (that is, the factor monoid $\mathcal{A}_n^*/\!\sim$) is the *plactic monoid of type* A_n and is denoted $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$. This definition coincides with the usual definitions via the Knuth relations or Young tableaux (see, for example, [HK02, Ch. 7]), and indeed we will use tableaux in the sequel. Figure 2 shows examples of isomorphic components of the crystal graph of type A_3. In Figure 1 on page 12, the two components $B(112)$ and $B(121)$ are isomorphic, but the two components comprising the isolated vertices ε and 123 are not isomorphic, since $\mathrm{wt}(\varepsilon) \neq \mathrm{wt}(123)$.

Note that if multiplication in P is algorithmically computable, then the weights of words in X^* are computable. If the crystal basis is finite (and so the crystal monoid is finitely generated), then it is possible to compute the connected component of any word in X^*. If both these conditions hold, then we can decide whether two components are isomorphic, and thus check whether two words are $\sim$-related. In short, we have the following:

Proposition 2.8. *If a crystal monoid arises from a finite crystal basis, and has a weight monoid in which multiplication is computable, then it has soluble word problem.*

In particular, when the weight monoid P is a free abelian group of finite rank (which it will be in all the specific examples we consider below) then Proposition 2.8 applies, and the crystal monoid will have soluble word problem. Notice, however, that this result says nothing about the *complexity* of the word problem. We will see that $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$ and the plactic monoids of other



FIGURE 2. Three isomorphic components of the crystal graph of type A_3. Vertices in the same position represent the same element of $\mathrm{Pl}(A_3)$. For example, 2113, 2131, and 2311 all represent the same element.

types, which we will define shortly, are all biautomatic and thus have word problem soluble in quadratic time [CRRT01, Corollary 3.7].

2.5. **Crystal graphs of types B_n, C_n, D_n and G_2.** In our running example above, we constructed the crystal graph of type A_n and defined the plactic monoid of type A_n. The 'type A_n' part of the name is because this plactic monoid parameterizes representations of the q-analogue of the universal enveloping algebra of the semisimple Lie algebras of type A_n. There are analogous plactic monoids of types B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2, parameterizing representations of the q-analogues of the universal enveloping algebras of the semisimple Lie algebras of the corresponding types. These plactic monoids arise as crystal monoids in the same way as $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$, but starting from different crystal bases and definitions of the weight function.

The weight functions defined here in this section are simply abstract versions of weights arising from the root systems of the corresponding Lie algebras; see [Lec07, § 3.3] for details.

2.5.1. *Type B_n.* For type B_n we consider the ordered alphabet

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \{1 < 2 < \ldots < n < 0 < \overline{n} < \ldots < \overline{2} < \overline{1}\}.$$

Note that 0 is greater than n. The crystal basis for type B_n is:

$$1 \xrightarrow{1} 2 \xrightarrow{2} \ldots \xrightarrow{n-1} n \xrightarrow{n} 0 \xrightarrow{n} \overline{n} \xrightarrow{n-1} \ldots \xrightarrow{2} \overline{2} \xrightarrow{1} \overline{1}$$

The weight function $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{B}_n^* \to \mathbb{Z}^n$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{wt}(1) &= (1, 0, \ldots, 0), \\
\mathrm{wt}(a) &= (\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0, -1, 1, 0, \ldots, 0}_{a-1\text{-th and } a\text{-th components nonzero}}) && \text{for } a \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\}; \\
\mathrm{wt}(n) &= (0, \ldots, 0, -1, 2), \\
\mathrm{wt}(0) &= (0, \ldots, 0), \\
\mathrm{wt}(\overline{a}) &= -\mathrm{wt}(a) && \text{for } a \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The resulting graph is the *crystal graph of type* B_n, denoted Γ_{B_n}, and the monoid that arises is the *plactic monoid of type* B_n, denoted $\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)$.

2.5.2. *Type* C_n. For type C_n we consider the ordered alphabet

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \left\{1 < 2 < \ldots < n < \overline{n} < \overline{n-1} < \ldots < \overline{1}\right\}.$$

The crystal basis for type C_n is:

$$1 \xrightarrow{1} 2 \xrightarrow{2} \ldots \xrightarrow{n-1} n \xrightarrow{n} \overline{n} \xrightarrow{n-1} \ldots \xrightarrow{2} \overline{2} \xrightarrow{1} \overline{1}\,,$$

The weight function $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{C}_n^* \to \mathbb{Z}^n$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{wt}(1) &= (1, 0, \ldots, 0), \\
\mathrm{wt}(a) &= (\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0, -1, 1, 0, \ldots, 0}_{a-1\text{-th and } a\text{-th components nonzero}}) && \text{for } a \in \{2, \ldots, n\}, \\
\mathrm{wt}(\overline{a}) &= -\mathrm{wt}(a) && \text{for } a \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The resulting graph is the *crystal graph of type* C_n, denoted Γ_{C_n}, and the monoid that arises is the *plactic monoid of type* C_n, denoted $\mathrm{Pl}(C_n)$.

2.5.3. *Type* D_n. For type D_n we consider the ordered alphabet

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{1 < 2 < \ldots < n-1 < \begin{matrix}\overline{n} \\ n\end{matrix} < \overline{n-1} < \ldots < \overline{2} < \overline{1}\right\};$$

note that n and $\overline{n}$ are incomparable and that $n-1 < n < \overline{n-1}$ and $n-1 < \overline{n} < \overline{n-1}$. The crystal basis for type D_n is:

$$1 \xrightarrow{1} 2 \xrightarrow{2} \ldots \xrightarrow{n-2} \begin{matrix} & n & \\ n-1 \nearrow & & \searrow n \\ n-1 & & \overline{n-1} \\ n \searrow & & \nearrow n-1 \\ & \overline{n} & \end{matrix} \xrightarrow{n-2} \ldots \xrightarrow{2} \overline{2} \xrightarrow{1} \overline{1}\,,$$

The weight function $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{D}_n^* \to \mathbb{Z}^n$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{wt}(1) &= (1, 0, \ldots, 0), \\
\mathrm{wt}(a) &= (\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0, -1, 1, 0, \ldots, 0}_{a-1\text{-th and } a\text{-th components nonzero}}) && \text{for } a \in \{2, \ldots, n-2\}, \\
\mathrm{wt}(n-1) &= (0, \ldots, 0, -1, 1, 1), \\
\mathrm{wt}(n) &= (0, \ldots, 0, -1, 2), \\
\mathrm{wt}(\overline{a}) &= -\mathrm{wt}(a) && \text{for } a \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The resulting graph is the *crystal graph of type* D_n, denoted Γ_{D_n}, and the monoid that arises is the *plactic monoid of type* D_n, denoted $\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)$.

2.5.4. *Type* G_2. For type G_2 we consider the ordered alphabet

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \{1 < 2 < 3 < 0 < \overline{3} < \overline{2} < \overline{1}\}.$$

The crystal basis for type G_2 is:

$$1 \xrightarrow{1} 2 \xrightarrow{2} 3 \xrightarrow{1} 0 \xrightarrow{1} \overline{3} \xrightarrow{2} \overline{2} \xrightarrow{1} \overline{1}\,, \tag{2.5}$$

The weight function $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{G}_2^* \to \mathbb{Z}^2$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{wt}(1) &= (1,0) \\ \mathrm{wt}(2) &= (-1,1), \\ \mathrm{wt}(3) &= (2,-1), \\ \mathrm{wt}(0) &= (0,0), \\ \mathrm{wt}(\overline{a}) &= -\mathrm{wt}(a) \qquad\qquad \text{for } a \in \{1,2,3\}. \end{aligned}$$

The resulting graph is the *crystal graph of type* G_2, denoted Γ_{G_2}, and the monoid that arises is the *plactic monoid of type* G_2, denoted $\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)$.

2.6. **Properties of crystal graphs of types** A_n**,** B_n**,** C_n**,** D_n **and** G_2**.** Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n or G_2, and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding alphabet $\mathcal{A}_n$, $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$, $\mathcal{D}_n$ or $\mathcal{G}_2$. As described above, we have a crystal graph Γ_X and a plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$ of each of the given types. For clarity and brevity in explanations, define, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x \leq y$,

$$\mathcal{X}[x,y] = \{\, z \in \mathcal{X} : x \leq z \leq y \,\}.$$

Recall that the Kashiwara operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ respectively raise and lower weights whenever they are defined.

An important and non-obvious fact for us will be that each connected component of a crystal graph Γ_X contains a *unique* highest-weight vertex [Lec07, § 3.1]. (It is not true for crystal monoids in general that the connected components of the crystal have have unique highest-weight vertices.) For any word $w \in \mathcal{X}^*$, denote by w^0 the unique highest-weight vertex in $B(w)$. Thus there exist $i_1, \ldots, i_r \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $w^0 = \tilde{e}_{i_1} \ldots \tilde{e}_{i_r}(w)$, or, equivalently $w = \tilde{f}_{i_r} \ldots \tilde{f}_{i_1}(w^0)$.

Notice that for Γ_X, we have $u \sim v$ if and only if $u^0 \sim v^0$ and there exist $i_1, \ldots, i_r \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that

$$u = \tilde{f}_{i_r} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_1}(u^0) \text{ and } v = \tilde{f}_{i_r} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_1}(v^0).$$

3. Strategy of proofs for rewriting systems

Before giving further definitions and background, we pause to outline the strategy of our proofs for our construction of rewriting systems. This will serve to motivate and place in context the tableaux theory we will shortly discuss. (We refer the reader forward to Subsection 6.1 for definitions and terminology on rewriting systems.)

Young tableaux serve as a cross-section of the plactic monoid of type A_n: two words in $\mathcal{A}_n^*$ represent the same element of $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$ if and only if they give the same tableau when Schensted's insertion algorithm (see [Sch61]

and [Lot02, Ch. 5]) is applied to them. The other types of plactic monoids have analogous (but substantially different) types of tableaux. Any of these tableaux, when read column-by-column from right to left, yields a word that represents the corresponding element of the monoid.

Thus the columns of a given type are generators for the plactic monoid of that type. Most products of columns are not tableaux. Following [Lec03], we call an arbitrary product of columns a tabloid. The key to constructing our rewriting systems and automatic structures is to use column generators and rewrite tabloids to tableaux. More formally, we consider a pair of columns that form a tabloid that is *not* a tableau. This is the left-hand side of a rewriting rule. The right-hand side of the corresponding rewriting rule is the unique tableau that represents the same element of the monoid as this tabloid. Pictorially, rewriting will look like the following



where T is the tableau representing the same element as the two shaded columns. Thus we gradually rewrite a tabloid towards a product of columns where every adjacent pair of columns forms a tableau; as we shall see, the whole product then forms a tableau.

The main difficulty in the proof is showing that this rewriting is terminating, and this requires a careful analysis of what shapes of tableaux can result from a product of two columns. This is where the theory of crystal graphs comes into play, for the operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ preserve shapes of tableaux. Thus it suffices to consider shapes of tableaux that can result from a *highest-weight* product of two columns, for we thus gain the information we need about arbitrary products of two columns. Section 5 contains the lemmata about products of two columns for all types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2. Armed with these lemmata, we construct the various rewriting systems in parallel in Section 6.

4. Tableaux and tabloids

In this section we give the necessary background on tableaux theory for plactic monoids types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2; see [KN94] and [Lec07] for further details.

4.1. **Young tableaux and columns.**

A Young diagram Y (of shape λ) associated to a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k)$ is a finite array of left-justified boxes whose i-th row has length λ_i. A *Young tableau* T of shape λ is a filling of a Young diagram by symbols from the fixed alphabet such that (i) the entries of any column strictly increase from top to bottom, and (ii) the entries along each row weakly increase from left to right.

A *column* (of type A_n) is a tableau of column shape $\lambda = (1, \dots, 1)$:



A *column* of type B_n, C_n and D_n is, respectively, a Young diagram of column shape of the form



where

- β_+ is filled with symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[1, n]$, and is strictly increasing from top to bottom;
- β_0 is filled with symbols 0;
- β_- is filled with symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{n}, \overline{1}]$, and is strictly increasing from top to bottom;
- γ_+ is filled with symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[1, n]$, and is strictly increasing from top to bottom;
- γ_- is filled with symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{n}, \overline{1}]$, and is strictly increasing from top to bottom;
- δ_+ is filled with symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[1, n-1]$, and is strictly increasing from top to bottom;
- δ_+ is filled with symbols n and $\overline{n}$, with different symbols in vertically adjacent cells.
- δ_- is filled with symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$, and is strictly increasing from top to bottom.

A *column* of type G_2 is a Young tableau with entries from $\mathcal{G}_2$, of column shape, of one of the following three forms:

$$\boxed{a}, \quad \begin{array}{|c|}\hline a \\ \hline b \\ \hline \end{array} \text{ with } a < b, \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 0 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

The *height* $h(\beta)$ of a column β (of any type) is the number of boxes in the column. The *reading* $w(\beta)$ of a column is the word obtained by reading the sequence of symbols in the boxes from top to bottom. We identify a column with its reading. A word is a *column word* if it the reading of a (necessarily unique) column.

4.1.1. *Admissible columns.* Let β be a column (of any type) and let $z \leq n$. We denote by $N_\beta(z)$ the number of symbols x in β such that $x \leq z$ or $\overline{z} \leq x$.

A column β is *admissible* if each of the following conditions is satisfied:

(1) $N_\beta(z) \leq z$, for any $z \leq n$;
(2) if β is of type B_n and 0 is in β, then $h(\beta) \leq n$;

(3) if $\beta = \begin{array}{|c|}\hline a \\ \hline b \\ \hline \end{array}$ is of type G_2 and height 2, then

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{dist}(a,b) \leq 2 & \text{for } a \in \{1,0\}, \\ \operatorname{dist}(a,b) \leq 3 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\operatorname{dist}(a,b)$ is the number of arrows between a and b in the crystal basis (2.5) for G_2.

Note that all columns of type A_n are admissible.

The following is a complete list of all twenty-one admissible columns of type G_2:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 2 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 3 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline \overline{3} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline \overline{2} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline \overline{1} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 1 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 2 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}, \right. \tag{4.1}$$
$$\left. \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 2 \\ \hline \overline{3} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 0 \\ \hline \overline{3} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 3 \\ \hline \overline{3} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 3 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 3 \\ \hline \overline{2} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 0 \\ \hline \overline{2} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline \overline{3} \\ \hline \overline{2} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline \overline{3} \\ \hline \overline{1} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline \overline{2} \\ \hline \overline{1} \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 0 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array} \right\}.$$

An *admissible column word* is a word that is the reading of a (necessarily unique) admissible column.

4.1.2. *The functions ℓ and r.* We say that a column β contains a pair $(z, \overline{z})$ if both symbols z and $\overline{z}$ appear in β, or if β is of type C_n and 0 appears in β. In the following paragraphs we define partial functions ℓ and r on the set of columns of some type. The resulting columns $\ell(\beta)$ and $r(\beta)$, when defined, do not contain pairs $(z, \overline{z})$. For simplicity and uniformity, for columns of type A_n we define $r(\beta) = \ell(\beta) = \beta$.

Let β be a column of type B_n or C_n and let $I_\beta = \{z_s < \ldots < z_{r+1} < z_r = 0, \ldots, z_1 = 0\}$ be the set of symbols z for which β contains the pair $(z, \overline{z})$. We say that a column β of type B_n or C_n can be *split* if there exists a set J_β of symbols $t_s < \cdots < t_1$ such that

- t_1 is maximal such that $t_1 < z_1$ and the symbols t_1 and $\overline{t_1}$ do not appear in β;
- for $i = 2, \ldots, s$, the symbol t_i is maximal such that $t_i < \min\{t_{i-1}, z_i\}$, $t_i \notin \beta$, and $\overline{t_i} \notin \beta$.

If β can be split, $r(\beta)$ is obtained from β by replacing $\overline{z_i}$ with $\overline{t_i}$ for each i, and $\ell(\beta)$ is obtained from β by replacing z_i with t_i for each i, always reordering to obtain a column if necessary (c.f. [Lec03, Example 3.1.7]).

The operators r and ℓ defined for columns of type B_n can be extended to columns of type D_n as follows: for any D_n column β, let β_0 be the column obtained by replacing all subwords $\overline{n}n$ by 00 in β. Note that β_0 is always a B_n column. Let $r(\beta)$ and $\ell(\beta)$ be $r(\beta_0)$ and $\ell(\beta_0)$ (as defined for type B_n columns). Observe that if β is a type D_n column that does not contain a subword $\overline{n}n$, it is also a B_n column and $\beta_0 = \beta$ and so the definitions of $r(\beta)$ and $\ell(\beta)$ coincide regardless of whether β is viewed as a column of type B_n or D_n.

A column β of type B_n, C_n or D_n is admissible if and only if both $r(\beta)$ and $\ell(\beta)$ are defined [Lec07, Proposition 4.3.3]. This fact will be important in the definition of tableaux in the following subsection.

4.2. **Tabloids and tableaux.** Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n or G_2. A *tabloid* of type X is a sequence of admissible columns $\beta_r, \dots, \beta_1$ of type X, which we write in a planar form by writing each column vertically beside each other in the order $\beta_r, \dots, \beta_1$ from left to right. For example,

(4.2)



is a tabloid with five columns. For brevity, we also use the inline form $\boxed{\beta_r}\cdots\boxed{\beta_1}$ to denote the tableau with columns $\beta_r, \dots, \beta_1$. The *reading* $w(T)$ of a tabloid $T = \boxed{\beta_r}\cdots\boxed{\beta_1}$ is the word $w(\beta_1)\cdots w(\beta_r)$. Note that the columns of the tabloid are read from rightmost to leftmost, and each column is read from top to bottom. Thus the reading of the tabloid (4.2) is $1\overline{5}43\overline{3}32451\overline{2}5\overline{3}2\overline{1}3\overline{2}$, as shown here:



Note that different tabloids may have the same reading. For example, the following tabloid has the same reading as (4.2):



For any word $u \in \mathcal{X}^*$ there is at least one tabloid whose reading is u: if $u = u_1 \cdots u_k$, where $u_i \in \mathcal{X}$, then the tabloid $\boxed{u_k}\cdots\boxed{u_1}$ has reading u. (Notice that each column $\boxed{u_i}$ (of height 1) is admissible.)

We now define a relation $\preceq$ on the sets of admissible columns of each type. For types A_n, B_n, C_n, and D_n, the definition proceeds as follows: for two admissible columns β_1 and β_2, define

- $\beta_2 \leq \beta_1$ if $h(\beta_2) \geq h(\beta_1)$ and the rows of the tabloid $\boxed{\beta_2}\boxed{\beta_1}$ are weakly increasing from left to right;
- $\beta_2 \preceq \beta_1$ if $r(\beta_2) \leq \ell(\beta_1)$.

Note that for any admissible column β, we have $\ell(\beta) \leq \beta \leq r(\beta)$; hence $\beta_2 \preceq \beta_1$ implies $\beta_2 \leq \beta_1$.



FIGURE 3. 'Hasse diagram' for the $\preceq$ relation on admissible G_2 columns. Columns further to the left in this diagram $\preceq$-precede those further to the right. Although this diagram illustrates how admissible G_2 columns are related by $\preceq$, it is important to recall that $\preceq$ is not reflexive and thus not a partial order.

For type G_2, the definition is more complicated: for columns β_1 and β_2, define

$$\begin{aligned}
\boxed{a} \preceq \boxed{b} &\iff (a \le b) \wedge \big((a,b) \neq (0,0)\big) \\
\begin{array}{|c|}\hline a \\ \hline b \\ \hline \end{array} \preceq \boxed{c} &\iff (a \le c) \wedge \big((a,c) \neq (0,0)\big) \\
\begin{array}{|c|}\hline a \\ \hline b \\ \hline \end{array} \preceq \begin{array}{|c|}\hline c \\ \hline d \\ \hline \end{array} &\iff (a \le c) \wedge \big((a,c) \neq (0,0)\big) \\
&\quad \wedge (b \le d) \wedge \big((b,d) \neq (0,0)\big) \\
&\quad \wedge \big(a \in \{2,3,0\} \implies \operatorname{dist}(a,d) \ge 3\big) \\
&\quad \wedge \big(a = \overline{3} \implies \operatorname{dist}(a,d) \ge 2\big)
\end{aligned}$$

A 'Hasse diagram' illustrating the order $\preceq$ on admissible columns of type G_2 is shown in Figure 3.

Note that the relation $\preceq$ is transitive and antisymmetric, but is not reflexive in general.

Let β_1, β_2 be columns of type D_n such that $h(\beta_2) \ge h(\beta_1)$. We say that the tabloid $\boxed{\beta_2}\boxed{\beta_1}$ contains an *a-configuration*, with $a \notin \{\overline{n}, n\}$, if:

- $a = x_p$, $\overline{n} = x_r$ are symbols of β_2 and $\overline{a} = y_s$, $n = y_q$ symbols of β_1; or
- $a = x_p$, $n = x_r$ are symbols of β_2 and $\overline{a} = y_s$, $\overline{n} = y_q$ symbols of β_1

where the integers p, q, r, s are such that $p \le q < r \le s$. Denote by $\mu(a)$ the integer defined by $\mu(a) = s - p$.

A *tableau* of type A_n, B_n, C_n or G_2 is a tabloid $\boxed{\beta_r}\cdots\boxed{\beta_1}$ such that $\beta_{i+1} \preceq \beta_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r-1$. A tableau of type D_n is a tabloid $\boxed{\beta_r}\cdots\boxed{\beta_1}$

such that $\beta_{i+1} \preceq \beta_i$ and the tabloid $\boxed{r(\beta_{i+1})}\boxed{\ell(\beta_i)}$ does not contain an a-configuration with $\mu(a) = n - a$, for all $i = 1, \dots, r-1$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $T = \boxed{\beta_m} \cdots \boxed{\beta_1}$ be a tabloid of type A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $u_j = w(\beta_j)$ for $j \in 1, \dots, m$, so that $w(T) = u_1 \cdots u_m$. Suppose $v = \tilde{f}_i(w(T))$ (respectively, $v = \tilde{e}_i(w(T))$) is defined. Factor v as $v = v_1 \cdots v_m$, where $|v_j| = |u_j|$. Then:*

1. *There exists some $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $v_j = u_j$ for $j \neq k$ and $v_k = \tilde{f}_i(u_k)$ (respectively, $v_k = \tilde{e}_i(u_k)$).*
2. *Each word v_j is an admissible column word, and so v is the reading of the tabloid $\boxed{\gamma_m} \cdots \boxed{\gamma_1}$.*
3. *For all $j \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, we have $\beta_{j+1} \preceq \beta_j$ if and only if $\gamma_{j+1} \preceq \gamma_j$. In particular, T is a tableau if and only if $\boxed{\gamma_m} \cdots \boxed{\gamma_1}$ is a tableau.*

Proof. See [KN94] for types A_n, B_n, C_n, and D_n; see [Lec07] for type G_2. □

In light of the preceding lemma, we can think of applying the operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ to a tabloid T: using the notation of the lemma, $\tilde{f}_i(T)$ (respectively, $\tilde{e}_i(T)$), when defined, is the tabloid $\boxed{\gamma_m} \cdots \boxed{\gamma_1}$. Note that $\tilde{f}_i$ and $\tilde{e}_i$ preserve shapes of tabloids and preserve the $\preceq$ relation between adjacent columns, and in particular preserve tableaux. Thus the words in a given connected component are readings of tabloids with the same shape. (See Figure 4.) Furthermore, iterated application of this lemma shows that in a given connected component of one of the crystal graphs, either every word is the reading of a tableau or no word is the reading of a tableau. In a connected component where every word is the reading of a tableau, all the corresponding tableaux have the same shape. (However, it is not true in general that two same-shape tabloids belong to the same component.)

We can now say that tabloid T has highest weight if $\tilde{e}_i(T)$ is undefined for all i. Note that this is equivalent to the word $w(T)$ being of highest weight. Furthermore, we have the following characterization of highest weight tableaux:

Lemma 4.2. *Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2. An X tableau has highest weight if and only if it has i-th row filled with i, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, except that in the $\mathcal{D}_n$ case the n-th row can instead be filled with $\overline{n}$.*

Proof. See [KN94] for types A_n, B_n, C_n, and D_n; see [Lec07] for type G_2. □

Note also that Lemma 4.2 can be recovered easily using the definition of the operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and the relation $\preceq$.

For example,

1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	
3	3	3			
4	4				



FIGURE 4. The three connected components of the crystal graph of type A_3 shown in Figure 2, but with vertices drawn as tableaux and tabloids rather than written as words. The left-hand component consists entirely of tableaux of the same shape. The other two components each consist of tabloids that are not tableaux. Although there are in general many tabloids with a given reading, it is always possible to view words in a given connected component as readings of tabloids of the same shape.

is a highest weight tableau of type A_n, B_n, C_n or D_n for any $n \geq 4$;

1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2		
$\overline{3}$	$\overline{3}$			

is a highest weight tableau of type D_3 (that is, D_n with $n = 3$); and

1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2		

is a highest weight tableau of type G_2.

Theorem 4.3 ([Lec07]). *Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2, and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding alphabet $\mathcal{A}_n$, $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$, $\mathcal{D}_n$ or $\mathcal{G}_2$. Then for any $u \in \mathcal{X}^*$, there is a unique tableau $P(u)$ such that $u \sim_X w(P(u))$. Thus the set of tableaux form a cross-section of the monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(X) = \mathcal{X}^*/\sim_X$.*

4.3. **Presentations for plactic monoids.** The classical plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n) = \mathcal{A}_n^*/{\sim_{A_n}}$ is presented by $\langle \mathcal{A}_n \,|\, \mathcal{R}_1^{A_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_2^{A_n} \rangle$, where

$$\mathcal{R}_1^{A_n} = \big\{ (yzx, yxz), (xzy, zxy) : x < y < z \big\};$$
$$\mathcal{R}_2^{A_n} = \big\{ (xyx, xxy), (xyy, yxy) : x < y \big\}.$$

These are the so-called *Knuth relations*.

For our purposes we use the convention that $\overline{0} = 0$ and that $\overline{\overline{z}} = z$.

The plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(B_n) = \mathcal{B}_n^*/{\sim_{B_n}}$ is presented by $\langle \mathcal{B}_n \,|\, \mathcal{R}_1^{B_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_2^{B_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_3^{B_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_4^{B_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_5^{B_n} \rangle$, where

$$\mathcal{R}_1^{B_n} = \big\{ (yzx, yxz), (xzy, zxy) : x \neq \overline{z} \wedge x < y < z \big\};$$
$$\mathcal{R}_2^{B_n} = \big\{ (xyx, xxy) : x \neq 0 \wedge x \neq \overline{y} \wedge x < y \big\} \cup \big\{ (xyy, yxy) : y \neq 0 \wedge x \neq \overline{y} \wedge x < y \big\};$$
$$\mathcal{R}_3^{B_n} = \big\{ (y\overline{(x-1)}(x-1), yx\overline{x}), (x\overline{x}y, \overline{(x-1)}(x-1)y) : 1 < x \leq n \wedge x \leq y \leq \overline{x} \big\} \cup \{(0\overline{n}n, \overline{n}n0)\};$$
$$\mathcal{R}_4^{B_n} = \big\{ (00x, 0x0), (0\overline{x}0, \overline{x}00) : x \leq n \big\};$$

and where the relation $\mathcal{R}_5^{B_n}$ is defined as follows: let $w = w(C)$ be a non-admissible column word for which each strict factor is admissible; let z be the smallest (with respect to $<$) unbarred symbol of w such that the pair $(z, \overline{z})$ occurs in w and $N_C(z) > z$, otherwise set $z = 0$. Let $\widetilde{w}$ be the column word obtained by erasing the pair $(z, \overline{z})$ in w if $z \leq n$ and erasing 0 otherwise. The relation $\mathcal{R}_5^{B_n}$ consists of all such pairs $(w, \tilde{w})$. (See [Lec03, Definition 3.2.2].)

Notice that relations $\mathcal{R}_1^{A_n}$ and $\mathcal{R}_2^{A_n}$ are the restrictions to the set $\mathcal{A}_n^*$ of the relations $\mathcal{R}_1^{B_n}$ and $\mathcal{R}_2^{B_n}$, respectively.

The plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(C_n) = \mathcal{C}_n^*/{\sim_{C_n}}$ is presented by $\langle \mathcal{C}_n \,|\, \mathcal{R}_1^{C_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_2^{C_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_3^{C_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_5^{C_n} \rangle$, where

$$\mathcal{R}_1^{C_n} = \mathcal{R}_1^{B_n}; \qquad \mathcal{R}_2^{C_n} = \mathcal{R}_2^{B_n}; \qquad \mathcal{R}_3^{C_n} = \mathcal{R}_3^{B_n}; \qquad \mathcal{R}_5^{C_n} = \mathcal{R}_5^{B_n};$$

except that we naturally exclude defining relations that involve 0. (See [Lec07, Definition 5.1.2].)

The plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(D_n) = \mathcal{D}_n^*/{\sim_{D_n}}$ is presented by $\langle \mathcal{D}_n \,|\, \mathcal{R}_1^{D_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_2^{D_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_3^{D_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_4^{D_n} \cup \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n} \rangle$, where

$$\mathcal{R}_1^{D_n} = \mathcal{R}_1^{B_n}; \qquad \mathcal{R}_2^{D_n} = \mathcal{R}_2^{B_n}; \qquad \mathcal{R}_3^{D_n} = \mathcal{R}_3^{B_n}; \qquad \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n} = \mathcal{R}_5^{B_n};$$

except that we naturally exclude defining relations that involve 0, and

$$\mathcal{R}_4^{D_n} = \big\{ (n\overline{n}\,\overline{n}, \overline{(n-1)}(n-1)\overline{n}), (\overline{n}nn, \overline{(n-1)}(n-1)n) \\ (\overline{n}\overline{(n-1)}(n-1), \overline{n}\,\overline{n}n), (n\overline{(n-1)}(n-1), nn\overline{n}) \big\}.$$

(See [Lec07, Definition 5.1.3].)

We now state the following auxiliary results that we will use in the sequel:

Lemma 4.4 ([Commuting columns lemma (CCL)])**.** *Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding alphabet $\mathcal{A}_n$, $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$ or $\mathcal{D}_n$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{X}[1, n]^*$ be words that are readings of columns (that is,*

strictly increasing words) such that every symbol of α appears in β. Then $\alpha\beta =_{\mathrm{Pl}(X)} \beta\alpha$.

Proof. This follows directly from the defining relations $\mathcal{R}_1^X$ and $\mathcal{R}_2^X$; one can also use Schensted's insertion algorithm for $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$ (see [Lot02, Chapter 5]) and note that the required defining relations also appear in the presentations for the other types of plactic monoid. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be one of the alphabets $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$ and $\mathcal{D}_n$. Consider a word $w = 12\cdots q\overline{x_1}\,\overline{x_2}\cdots\overline{x_k}$ for some $q \in \mathcal{X}[1,n]$, $\overline{x_i} \in \mathcal{X}[\overline{q},\overline{1}]$ and $1 \leq x_k < x_{k-1} < \ldots < x_1 \leq q$. Then $w =_{\mathrm{Pl}(\mathcal{X})} u$, where u is the word obtained from $12\cdots q$ by deleting the symbols $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k$. In particular, u is either empty or is an admissible column containing fewer than q symbols.*

Proof. Let $u^{(i)}$ be the word obtained by deleting $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ from $12\cdots q$. Then $u^{(i)}\overline{x_{i+1}} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(\mathcal{X})} u^{(i+1)}$ is an $\mathcal{R}_5^{\mathcal{X}}$ relation. Note that $w = u^{(0)}$. By induction, therefore, $u = u^{(k)}$ is a column with $u^{(0)}\overline{x_1}\ldots\overline{x_k} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(\mathcal{X})} u^{(k)}$. Clearly $|u|$ is less than q. Since u contains only symbols from $\mathcal{X}[1,q]$, it follows that $N_u(z) \leq z$ for all z and so u is an admissible column if it is non-empty. □

Giving a presentation for $\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)$ requires the auxiliary partial map Θ on $\mathcal{G}_2^2$ defined as per the following table:

w	21	31	01	$\overline{3}1$	$\overline{3}2$	$\overline{2}1$	$\overline{2}2$	$\overline{1}1$	$\overline{1}2$	$\overline{2}3$	$\overline{1}3$	$\overline{1}0$	$\overline{13}$	$\overline{12}$
$w\Theta$	12	13	23	20	$2\overline{3}$	30	$3\overline{3}$	00	$0\overline{3}$	$3\overline{2}$	$0\overline{2}$	$\overline{32}$	$\overline{31}$	$\overline{21}$

The monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)$ is presented by $\langle \mathcal{G}_2 \,|\, \mathcal{R}_1^{G_2} \cup \mathcal{R}_2^{G_2} \cup \mathcal{R}_3^{G_2} \cup \mathcal{R}_4^{G_2} \rangle$ (see [Lec07, Definition 5.1.4]), where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2} &= \big\{(10,1), (1\overline{3},2), (1\overline{2},3), (2\overline{2},0), (2\overline{1},\overline{3}), (3\overline{1},\overline{2}), (0\overline{1},\overline{1})\big\},\\
\mathcal{R}_2^{G_2} &= \big\{(1\overline{1},\varepsilon)\big\},\\
\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2} &= \big\{\, (abc, a(bc)\Theta) : ab \in \operatorname{im}\Theta, bc \in \operatorname{dom}\Theta \,\big\}\\
&\qquad \cup \big\{\, (abc, (ab)\Theta^{-1}c) : ab \in \operatorname{im}\Theta, b \geq c, bc \neq 00, bc \notin \operatorname{dom}\Theta \,\big\},\\
\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2} &= \big\{(123,110)\big\}\\
&\qquad \cup \big\{\, ((abc, (ab)\Theta^{-1}c) : ab \in \operatorname{im}\Theta, bc \in \operatorname{im}\Theta, abc \neq 123 \,\big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have given this presentation in a slightly different way from Lecouvey [Lec07, Definition 5.1.4], but the sets of defining relations $\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}$, $\mathcal{R}_2^{G_2}$, $\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}$, and $\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}$ still correspond to the crystal isomorphisms identified by Lecouvey, and hence these relations generate the same congruence as those of Lecouvey.

5. Two-column lemmata

As described in the strategic overview of our proofs in Section 3, this section examines products of two admissible columns that do not form a tableau. In order to prove that the rewriting system we will construct is terminating, we have to know about the shape of the tableau that results from this product. Informally, we will show that the resulting tableau either:

(1) Has fewer entries than the original two columns.



FIGURE 5. Roadmap of dependencies of two-column lemmata in case A_n. Lemmata 5.1 and 5.2 give the possibilities for α and the first symbol of β. (The value p lies in $\mathcal{A}_n[1, n-1]$.) The roadmap then shows which lemmata apply to which cases, and how the various lemmata depend on each other. Lemma 5.7 is the concluding result that gathers all of the information we need.

(2) Has the same number of entries but only one column.
(3) Has the same number of entries, two columns, and has a shorter rightmost column.

The results are given formally in the following five subsections as Lemmata 5.7, 5.24, 5.15, 5.37, and 5.39. These lemmata actually give more information than we need for proving termination of the rewriting system, because we will also use them in proving biautomaticity later in the paper. We consider the classical types in the order A_n, C_n, B_n, D_n, reflecting the increasing order of complexity of the arguments. Type G_2 is considered last, because it uses a rather different approach from the other types.

5.1. A_n. Throughout this section, let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$ be columns such that $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$ and $\alpha\beta$ is a word of highest weight. Note that the tabloid $\boxed{\beta}\boxed{\alpha}$ is not a tableau. Our aim is to learn about the shape of $P(\alpha\beta)$ (where $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the unique tableau whose reading is equal to $\alpha\beta$ in the plactic monoid $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$; see Theorem 4.3); for the conclusion, see Lemma 5.7. There are essentially two cases, depending on whether the first symbol of β is not 1 (treated in Lemma 5.4) or is 1 (treated in Lemma 5.6). The proof of Lemma 5.6 uses Lemma 5.4, and indeed we need to prove a number of subsidiary lemmata along the way. Figure 5 is a 'roadmap' showing the dependencies between the lemmata.

Lemma 5.1. *We have $\alpha = 1\cdots p$ for some $p \in \mathcal{A}_n[1, n]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, α is a highest weight column (and thus a highest-weight tableau), and thus has the required form by Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 5.2. (1) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-1$, then the first symbol of β is 1 or $p+1$.*
(2) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$, then the first symbol of β is 1.*

Proof. Let x be the first symbol of β, so that $\beta = x\beta'$.

(1) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-1$. Recall the technique for practical computation of $\tilde{e}_i$ given in after Proposition 2.1. Then

$$x \in \mathcal{A}_n[2,p] \implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{\ -}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots;$$
$$x \in \mathcal{A}_n[p+2,n] \implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ \ - \ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots.$$

(The overbraces indicate where the symbols + and − come from. We will use this notation without further comment throughout this section.) In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1 or $p+1$.

(2) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$. Then

$$x \in \mathcal{A}_n[2,n] \implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{\ -}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots$$

This contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibility is that x is 1. □

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ and β begins with $p+1$. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the single column $\alpha\beta$.*

Proof. Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for $p \leq n$. Since the first symbol of β is not 1, Lemma 5.2 shows that $p \leq n-1$ and β begins with $p+1$. Since α is a column ending in p and β is a column beginning with $p+1$, it follows that $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta$. □

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose the first symbol of β is not 1. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemmata 5.2 and 5.3. □

Let β_1 be the maximal prefix of β whose symbols form an interval of $\mathcal{A}_n$ (viewed as an ordered set).

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then β_1 is a proper prefix of α.*

Proof. Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for $p \leq n$. Since the first symbol of β is 1, then $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$ for some $s \leq n$. If $s \geq p$, then $\beta \preceq \alpha$, which is a contradiction, so $s < p$ and so β_1 is a proper prefix of α. □

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ consists of two columns, the rightmost column of $P(\alpha\beta)$ is β_1, which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols, and in total $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols.*

Proof. Let $\hat{\beta}$ be such that $\beta = \beta_1\hat{\beta}$. By Lemma 5.5, $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$ is a proper prefix of α. So $\alpha\beta_1 =_{\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)} \beta_1\alpha$ by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4 and so $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)} \beta_1\alpha\hat{\beta}$.



FIGURE 6. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.6 (the case where β begins with 1). The prefix β_1 of β is a proper prefix of α by Lemma 5.5. It thus commutes past α by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4. The two left-hand columns are now α and $\hat{\beta}$ (which does not begin with 1), and thus we can apply Lemma 5.4 in the case where β does not begin with 1, but using $\hat{\beta}$ in place of β.

We now want to apply Lemma 5.4 with $\hat{\beta}$ in place of β (since 1 is not the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$) and so deduce that $P(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ is the column $\alpha\hat{\beta}$. (See Figure 6.) To do this, we need to prove that $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest-weight word and that $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \alpha$. We will then obtain the result as follows: since β_1 is a proper prefix of α and thus of $\alpha\hat{\beta}$, we have $\beta_1 \preceq \alpha\hat{\beta}$ and so $P(\alpha\beta) = \beta_1\alpha\hat{\beta}$, the rightmost column of which is β_1, which is a proper prefix of α and so contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols. Finally, note that $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $|\beta_1\alpha\hat{\beta}| = |\alpha\beta|$ symbols.

It remains to show that $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest-weight word and that $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \alpha$. Let us prove the first claim. For $i < s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = +- = \varepsilon$, and for $i > s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = \varepsilon$. Hence if $i \neq s$, we have $\rho_i(\alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta}) = \rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$. Furthermore, $\rho_s(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$, because it does not contain s (since $\beta_1\hat{\beta}$ is a column) and does not contain the $s+1$ (by the maximality of β_1), and these are the only symbols that could contribute $+$ or $-$ to the image of ρ_s. Hence $\rho_s(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +-\rho_s(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$. In each case, $\rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ does not start with $-$ and so $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest weight word.

Now we turn to proving that $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \alpha$. Since the first symbol of β is 1 and β is a column, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ cannot be 1. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $\hat{\beta}$ and α (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \alpha$. □

Lemma 5.7 (Two-column lemma for type A_n)**.** *The tableau $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and consists of either one column or two columns, the rightmost of which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.*

Proof. If the first symbol of β is 1, then by Lemma 5.6, $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols and consists of two columns, the rightmost of which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols. Otherwise, by Lemma 5.4, $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta$, which contains $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. □

Before proceeding to the other cases, we emphasize the following: In the proof of Lemma 5.6, when β begins with 1, we first of all deal with the prefix β_1 of β. After this, we are reduce to the case where β does not begin with



FIGURE 7. Roadmap of dependencies of two-column lemmata in case C_n. Lemmata 5.8 and 5.9 give the possibilities for α and the first symbol of β. (The value p lies in $\mathcal{C}_n[1, n-1]$.) Note the additional cases and complexity, as compared with type A_n. Lemma 5.15 is the concluding result that gathers all of the information we need.

1. This idea of dealing with a prefix and then reducing to other cases will be used many times in the lemmata for types C_n, B_n, and D_n, and it this that sometimes necessitates considering cases in what might naively seem like an odd order.

5.2. C_n**.** Throughout this subsection, let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}_n^*$ be admissible columns such that $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$ and $\alpha\beta$ is of highest weight. As in the previous subsection, our aim is to learn about the shape of $P(\alpha\beta)$. The conclusion, as given in Lemma 5.15, is similar to the A_n case, with the additional possibility that $P(\alpha\beta)$ can contain contain fewer than $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols (and indeed may be empty). The case analysis is more complicated: although the main division is into the cases where the first symbol of β is 1 or is not 1, this second case require further subdivision. The 'roadmap' showing dependencies between lemmata is given in Figure 7.

Lemma 5.8. *We have $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for some $p \in \mathcal{C}_n[1, n]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, α is a highest weight column (and thus a highest-weight tableau), and thus has the required form by Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 5.9. (1) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-1$, then the first symbol of β is 1, $p+1$, or $\overline{p}$.*
(2) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$, then the first symbol of β is 1 or $\overline{n}$.*

Proof. Let x be the first symbol of β, so that $\beta = x\beta'$.



FIGURE 8. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.10. The two columns concatenate to form a non-admissible column, and then relations from $\mathcal{R}_5^{C_n}$ are applied to turn it into an admissible column. The greyed $\overline{q}$ indicates a symbol that is not contained in β, and so q 'survives' in $P(\alpha\beta)$ after the application of relations from $\mathcal{R}_5^{C_n}$.

(1) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \mathcal{C}_n[2,p] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\ \overbrace{-}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{C}_n[p+2,n] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ \ - \ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{C}_n[\overline{n},\overline{p+1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ \ - \ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') \ = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{C}_n[\overline{p-1},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = +- \ - \ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') \ = -\cdots.
\end{aligned}$$

(Recall our convention that $\overline{\overline{z}} = z$.) In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1, $p+1$, or $\overline{p}$.

(2) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \mathcal{C}_n[2,n] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\ \overbrace{-}^{x}\ \rho_{x}(\beta') = -\cdots\\
x \in \mathcal{C}_n[\overline{n-1},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = +- \ - \ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') = -\cdots
\end{aligned}$$

In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1 or $\overline{n}$. □

The next step will be to analyze what happens in the two cases of Lemma 5.9 when the first symbol of β is not 1. As we will show, in each situation $P(\alpha\beta)$ is a single column that contains no more than $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols.

First we consider the possibilities arising from cases 1 and 2 of Lemma 5.9 where the first symbol of β is $\overline{p}$ or $\overline{n}$:

Lemma 5.10. *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for $p \leq n$ and the first symbol of β is $\overline{p}$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single admissible column that is a proper prefix of α. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{q},\overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.*

Proof. (See Figure 8.) The word β is a column and so consists of symbols $\overline{x_1}\,\overline{x_2}\ldots\overline{x_k}$ with $x_k < x_{k-1} < \ldots < x_1 = p$. Thus by Lemma 4.5, $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a column containing fewer that $p = |\alpha|$ symbols, and, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$. Since $\alpha\beta$ is of highest weight, so is $P(\alpha\beta)$. Thus, if it is non-empty, it is a prefix of $1\cdots n$. Since it contains fewer than p symbols, it is thus a proper prefix of $\alpha = 1\cdots p$. □

Parallel to the previous subsection, let β_1 be the maximal prefix of β whose symbols form an interval of $\mathcal{C}_n[1, n]$ (viewed as an ordered set).

First we consider another possibility arising from case 1 of Lemma 5.9, where the first symbol of β is $p + 1$:

Lemma 5.11. *Suppose $\alpha = 1\cdots p$ and $\beta_1 = (p+1)\cdots t$ for $p < t \leq n$. Let $\hat{\beta}$ be such that $\beta = \beta_1\hat{\beta}$. Then:*

1. *If $\hat{\beta} = \varepsilon$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1 = 1\cdots t$.*
2. *If $\hat{\beta} \neq \varepsilon$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a proper prefix of $1\cdots t$. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$.*

Proof. If $\hat{\beta} = \varepsilon$, then $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1 = 1\cdots p(p+1)\cdots t = \alpha\beta$, which is a column.

So assume that $\hat{\beta} \neq \varepsilon$. Let $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha\beta_1 = 1\cdots(p+1)p\cdots t = 1\cdots t$. Note that $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta} = \alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta} = \alpha\beta$ and so $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}$ has highest weight. The words $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are also admissible columns, and the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is certainly not 1. Thus neither is the first symbol of $r(\hat{\beta})$, since r can only replace a symbol x with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $r(\hat{\beta})$ and $\ell(\hat{\alpha}) = \hat{\alpha}$ (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \hat{\alpha}$.

Thus Lemma 5.9 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and t in place of α, β, and p, respectively. Consider the cases that can arise:

1. If $t \leq n - 1$, case 1 of Lemma 5.9 holds and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is either 1, $t+1$, or $\overline{t}$. As noted above, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is not 1. By the maximality of the prefix β_1, the symbol $t+1$ is not in β and thus cannot be the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$. Therefore the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is $\overline{t}$, and so Lemma 5.10 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and t in place of α, β, and p, respectively, to show that $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ is empty or a proper prefix of $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha\beta_1 = 1\cdots t$. Note also that, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, then neither does $\hat{\beta}$ and so in this case $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ must contain $1\cdots q$. Since $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}) = P(\alpha\beta)$ and $|\hat{\alpha}| = |\alpha\beta_1| \leq |\alpha\beta|$, the result follows.
2. If $t = n$, case 2 of Lemma 5.9 holds and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is either 1 or $\overline{n}$. As noted above, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is not 1; it is thus $\overline{n}$. So Lemma 5.10 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in place of α and β, respectively, to show that $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ is empty or a proper prefix of $1\cdots n$. Note also that, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, then neither does $\hat{\beta}$ and so in this case $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ must contain $1\cdots q$. Since $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}) = P(\alpha\beta)$ and $|\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}| = |\alpha\beta|$, the result follows. □

Lemma 5.12. *Suppose the first symbol of β is not 1. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of $1\cdots n$ and contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. If $\beta = \beta_1$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta$. If β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$.*

Proof. One of the two cases of Lemma 5.9 holds, with the first symbol of β not being 1:

(1) In case 1, the result follows from Lemmata 5.10 and 5.11.
(2) In case 2, the result follows from Lemma 5.10. □

This completes the analysis when the first symbol of β is not 1. We now turn to the case when the first symbol is 1, but we will apply some of the preceding lemmata during the analysis.

Lemma 5.13. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then β_1 is a proper prefix of α. Furthermore, in the case where $\beta_1 = 1\cdots s$:*

(1) *if $s < n-1$, then the symbol $s+1$ and symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$ are not in β;*
(2) *if $s = n-1$ and $\alpha = 1\cdots n$, then either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$, and so symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$ are not in β.*

Proof. Since the first symbol of β is 1, we have $\beta_1 = 1\cdots s$ for some $s \leq n$. If $s \geq p$, then $\beta \preceq \alpha$, which is a contradiction, so $s < p$ and so β_1 is a proper prefix of α. In particular, since $p \leq n$, it is impossible that $s = n$, and so $s \leq n-1$.

Suppose $s < n-1$. Then $s+1$ is not a symbol of β_1 since β_1 has maximal length, and so all other symbols of β are strictly greater than $s+1$; hence $s+1$ is not a symbol of β. Furthermore, if $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{C}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$, then $\overline{x}$ is not a symbol of β, since otherwise $N_\beta(x) = x+1 > x$, contradicting β being admissible.

Suppose that $s = n-1$ and so $\alpha = 1\cdots n$. Then β cannot contain any symbol x from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$, for this would imply $N_\beta(x) > x$, contradicting β being admissible. So, since the length of an admissible column is bounded by n, we have $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$ or $\beta = \beta_1 n$. The last possibility gives $\beta = \alpha$, contradicting $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$. □

Lemma 5.14. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains two columns, contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and its rightmost column is β_1, which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.*

Proof. (See Figure 9.) Let $\hat{\beta}$ be such that $\beta = \beta_1\hat{\beta}$. By Lemma 5.13, $\beta_1 = 1\cdots s$ is a proper prefix of α. So $\alpha\beta_1 =_{\mathrm{Pl}(C_n)} \beta_1\alpha$ by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4 and so $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(C_n)} \beta_1\alpha\hat{\beta}$.

We now aim to show that $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest-weight word. We have to consider several cases:

(1) Suppose that $s < n-1$. Then for $i < s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = +- = \varepsilon$, and for $i > s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = \varepsilon$. Hence if $i \neq s$, we have $\rho_i(\alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta}) = \rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$. Furthermore, $\rho_s(\hat{\beta}) = +^k$ where $k \in \{0, 1\}$, because $\hat{\beta}$ contains at most one symbol $\overline{s+1}$ (since $\beta_1\hat{\beta}$ is a column), does not contain a symbol s (by the maximality of β_1), and does not contain the symbols $s+1$ or $\overline{s}$ (by Lemma 5.13), and these are the



FIGURE 9. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.14 (where β begins with 1). The prefix β_1 of β is a proper prefix $1 \cdots s$ of α by Lemma 5.13, and $\overline{s}$ and subsequent symbols are not in β. The column β_1 thus commutes past α by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4. The two left-hand columns are now α and $\hat{\beta}$ (which does not begin with 1 or contain $\overline{s}$ or any subsequent symbol), and thus we can apply Lemma 5.12 in the case where β does not begin with 1, but using $\hat{\beta}$ in place of β; this shows that s 'survives' in the leftmost column of $P(\alpha\beta)$.

only symbols that could contribute $+$ or $-$ to the image of ρ_s. Hence $\rho_s(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +-+^k = +^k$.

(2) Suppose that $s = n-1$. For $i \leq n-1$, the same reasoning as in the previous case shows that $\rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ is either empty or begins with $+$. It remains to consider $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta})$. Note that $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$ (since β is a proper prefix of α); thus $\rho_n(\alpha) = +$. By Lemma 5.13 either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$.
   (a) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1$. Then $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$, so $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +$.
   (b) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$. Then $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = -$ and so $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +- = \varepsilon$.

In each case, $\rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ does not start with $-$ and so $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest weight word.

Since the first symbol of β is 1 and β is a column, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ cannot be 1. Thus neither is the first symbol of $r(\hat{\beta})$, since r can only replace a symbol x with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $r(\hat{\beta})$ and $\ell(\alpha) = \alpha$ (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \alpha$.

Thus by Lemma 5.12 with $\hat{\beta}$ in place of β, $P(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = \gamma$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$ and contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}|$ symbols. Furthermore, since β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$, neither does $\hat{\beta}$, and so γ contains $1 \cdots s$. Hence $\gamma \preceq \beta_1$ and so $P(\alpha\beta) = \beta_1\gamma$. Since β_1 is a proper prefix of α, it contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.

Finally, since γ contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}|$ symbols, $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}| + |\beta_1| = |\alpha\beta|$ symbols. □

Lemma 5.15 (Two-column lemma for type C_n)**.** *The tableau $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and is either empty or consists of either one*



FIGURE 10. Roadmap of dependencies of two-column lemmata in case B_n. Lemmata 5.16 and 5.17 give the possibilities for α and the first symbol of β. (The value p lies in $\mathcal{B}_n[1, n-1]$.) This is slightly more complicated than the C_n case. Lemma 5.24 is the concluding result that gathers all of the information we need.

column or two columns, the rightmost of which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.

Proof. If the first symbol of β is 1, then by Lemma 5.14, $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains two columns, contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and its rightmost column contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols. If the first symbol of β is not 1, then by either of the possibilities in Lemma 5.12, $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a column containing at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. □

5.3. B_n. Throughout this section, let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{B}_n^*$ be admissible columns such that $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$ and $\alpha\beta$ is of highest weight. As in the previous subsections, our aim is to learn about the shape of $P(\alpha\beta)$. The conclusion, as given in Lemma 5.24, is identical (in statement, not in proof) to the C_n case. This reflects the fact that the case analysis is similar to type C_n but with the additional complication of the extra symbol 0 in the alphabet.

Lemma 5.16. *We have $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}_n[1, n]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, α is a highest weight column (and thus a highest-weight tableau), and thus has the required form by Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 5.17. (1) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-1$, then the first symbol of β is 1, $p+1$, or $\overline{p}$.*
(2) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$, then the first symbol of β is 1, 0, or $\overline{n}$.*

Proof. Let x be the first symbol of β, so that $\beta = x\beta'$.

(1) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \mathcal{B}_n[2,p] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{\ -}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{B}_n[p+2,n] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ \ -\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x = 0 &\implies \rho_n(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ -+\rho_x(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x = \overline{n} &\implies \rho_n(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ --\rho_n(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{B}_n[\overline{n-1},\overline{p+1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ \ -\ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{B}_n[\overline{p-1},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = +-\ -\ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') = -\cdots.
\end{aligned}$$

In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1, $p+1$, or $\overline{p}$.

(2) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \mathcal{B}_n[2,n] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{\ -}^{x}\ \rho_x(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{B}_n[\overline{n-1},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = +-\ -\ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') = -\cdots.
\end{aligned}$$

In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1, 0, or $\overline{n}$. □

The next step will be to analyze what happens in the two cases of Lemma 5.17 when the first symbol of β is not 1. As we will show, in each situation $P(\alpha\beta)$ is a single column that contains no more than $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols.

First we consider the possibilities arising from cases 1 and 2 of Lemma 5.17 where the first symbol of β is $\overline{p}$ or $\overline{n}$:

Lemma 5.18. *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for $p \leq n$ and the first symbol of β is $\overline{p}$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single admissible column that is a proper prefix of α. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{q},\overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.*

Proof. (The reader may wish to refer to Figure 8, which illustrates this proof when symbols C are replaced by B throughout.) The word β is a column and so consists of symbols $\overline{x_1}\,\overline{x_2}\ldots\overline{x_k}$ with $1 \leq x_k < x_{k-1} < \ldots < x_1 = p$. (Note that β does not include symbols 0.) Thus by Lemma 4.5, $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a column containing fewer that $p = |\alpha|$ symbols, and, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{C}_n[\overline{q},\overline{1}]$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$. Since $\alpha\beta$ is of highest weight, so is $P(\alpha\beta)$. Thus, if it is non-empty, it is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$. Since it contains fewer than p symbols, it is thus a prefix of $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$. □

The other possibility arising from case 1 of Lemma 5.17, where the first symbol of β is $p+1$, will be considered later since it reduces to some of the other cases.

The next step is to consider the possibility in case 2 of Lemma 5.17 where β begins with 0:

Lemma 5.19. *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$ and the first symbol of β is 0, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix (not necessarily proper) of*



FIGURE 11. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.19. The two columns concatenate to form a non-admissible column which contains symbols 0, and then relations from $\mathcal{R}_5^{C_n}$ are applied to turn it into an admissible column. Either β consists entirely of symbols 0, in which case γ is empty and $P(\alpha\beta) = \alpha = 1 \cdots n$, or else Lemma 5.17 shows that γ begins with $\overline{n}$, in which case Lemma 5.18 applies with γ in place of β. The greyed $\overline{q}$ indicates a symbol that is not contained in β, and so q 'survives' in $P(\alpha\beta)$.

α. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.

Proof. (See Figure 11.) Let $\beta = 0^h\gamma$, where $h \geq 1$ is maximal. Then $1 \cdots n0 =_{\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)} 1 \cdots n$ is a relation of type $\mathcal{R}_5^{B_n}$. Thus $\alpha\beta =_{\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)} \alpha\gamma$ by a sequence of applications of relations of type $\mathcal{R}_5^{B_n}$. If γ is empty, $P(\alpha\beta) = \alpha$. So assume γ is not empty. Note that by the maximality of h, the word γ is a column beginning with a symbol in $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{n}, \overline{1}]$; this implies that $\gamma \not\preceq \alpha$. Since $\alpha\beta =_{\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)} \alpha\gamma$, the word $\alpha\gamma$ has highest weight. So, by Lemma 5.17 with γ in place of β, the first symbol of γ is $\overline{n}$. Thus by Lemma 5.18, $P(\alpha\beta) = P(\alpha\gamma)$ is equal to a single column that is a proper prefix of α. Finally note that if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, neither does γ, and so in this case $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$. □

Parallel to the previous subsection, let β_1 be the maximal prefix of β whose symbols form an interval of $\mathcal{B}_n[1, n]$ (viewed as an ordered set).

First we consider another possibility arising from case 1 of Lemma 5.17, where the first symbol of β is $p+1$:

Lemma 5.20. *Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ and $\beta_1 = (p+1) \cdots t$ for $p < t \leq n$. Let $\hat{\beta}$ be such that $\beta = \beta_1 \hat{\beta}$.*

1. *If $\hat{\beta} = \varepsilon$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots t$.*
2. *If $\hat{\beta} \neq \varepsilon$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$ and contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.*

Proof. If $\hat{\beta} = \varepsilon$, then $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots p(p+1) \cdots t = \alpha\beta$, which is a column.

So assume that $\hat{\beta} \neq \varepsilon$. Let $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots (p+1)p \cdots t = 1 \cdots t$. Note that $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta} = \alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta} = \alpha\beta$ and so $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}$ has highest weight. The words $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are also admissable columns, and the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is certainly not 1. Thus neither is the first symbol of $r(\hat{\beta})$, since r can only replace a symbol x with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $r(\hat{\beta})$ and $\ell(\hat{\alpha}) = \hat{\alpha}$ (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \hat{\alpha}$.

Thus Lemma 5.17 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and t in place of α, β, and p, respectively. Consider the cases that can arise:

1. If $t \leq n-1$, case 1 of Lemma 5.17 holds and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is either 1, $t+1$, or $\overline{t}$. As noted above, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is not 1. By the maximality of the prefix β_1, the symbol $t+1$ is not in β and thus cannot be the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$. Therefore the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is $\overline{t}$, and so Lemma 5.18 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and t in place of α, β, and p, respectively, to show that $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ is a proper prefix of $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots t$ containing fewer that $|\hat{\alpha}|$ symbols. Note also that, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, then neither does $\hat{\beta}$ and so in this case $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ must contain $1 \cdots q$. Since $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}) = P(\alpha\beta)$ and $|\hat{\alpha}| = |\alpha\beta_1| \leq |\alpha\beta|$, the result follows.
2. If $t = n$, case 2 of Lemma 5.17 holds and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is either 1, 0, or $\overline{n}$. As noted above, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is not 1. So Lemma 5.18 or Lemma 5.19 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in place of α and β, respectively, to show that $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$ that contains at most $|\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}|$ symbols. Note also that, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, then neither does $\hat{\beta}$ and so in this case $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ must contain $1 \cdots q$. Since $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}) = P(\alpha\beta)$ and $|\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}| = |\alpha\beta|$, the result follows. □

Lemma 5.21. *Suppose the first symbol of β is not 1. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$ and contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. If $\beta = \beta_1$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta$. If β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.*

Proof. One of the two cases of Lemma 5.17 holds, with the first symbol of β not being 1:

1. In case 1, the result follows from Lemmata 5.18 and 5.20.

(2) In case 2, the result follows from Lemmata 5.19 and 5.18. □

Finally, it remains to consider what happens when the first symbol of β is 1.

Lemma 5.22. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then β_1 is a proper prefix of α. Furthermore, if $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$, then*

(1) *if $s < n-1$, then the symbols $s+1$ and symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$ are not in β.*
(2) *if $s = n-1$ and $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$, then either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1 0$ or $\beta = \beta_1 \overline{n}$, and so symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$ are not in β.*

Proof. Since the first symbol of β is 1, we have $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$, and $s \leq n$. If $s \geq p$, then $\beta \preceq \alpha$, which is a contradiction, so $s < p$ and so β_1 is a proper prefix of α. In particular, since $p \leq n$, it is impossible that $s = n$, and so $s \leq n-1$.

Suppose $s < n-1$. Then $s+1$ is not a symbol of β_1 since β_1 has maximal length, and so all other symbols of β are strictly greater than $s+1$; hence $s+1$ is not a symbol of β. Furthermore, if $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{B}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$, then $\overline{x}$ is not a symbol of β, since otherwise $N_\beta(x) = x + 1 > x$, contradicting β being admissible.

Suppose that $s = n-1$ and so $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$. Then β cannot contain any symbol x from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$, for this would imply $N_\beta(x) > x$, contradicting β being admissible. So, since the length of an admissible column is bounded by n, we have $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1 0$ or $\beta = \beta_1 \overline{n}$ or $\beta = \beta_1 n$. The last possibility gives $\beta = \alpha$, contradicting $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$. □

Lemma 5.23. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains two columns, contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and its rightmost column is β_1, which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.*

Proof. (The reader may wish to refer to Figure 9, which illustrates this proof when symbols C are replaced by B throughout, and the references to Lemmata 5.13 and 5.12 are replaced by Lemmata 5.22 and 5.21.) Let $\hat{\beta}$ be such that $\beta = \beta_1 \hat{\beta}$. By Lemma 5.22, $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$ is a proper prefix of α. So $\alpha\beta_1 =_{\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)} \beta_1 \alpha$ by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4 and so $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)} \beta_1\alpha\hat{\beta}$.

We now aim to show that $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest-weight word. We have to consider several cases:

(1) Suppose that $s < n-1$. Then for $i < s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = +- = \varepsilon$, and for $i > s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = \varepsilon$. Hence if $i \neq s$, we have $\rho_i(\alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta}) = \rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$. Furthermore, $\rho_s(\hat{\beta}) = +^k$, where $k \in \{0, 1\}$, because $\hat{\beta}$ contains at most one symbol $\overline{s+1}$ (since $\beta_1\hat{\beta}$ is a column), does not contain a symbol s (by the maximality of β_1), and does not contain the symbols $s+1$ or $\overline{s}$ (by Lemma 5.22), and these are the only symbols that could contribute $+$ or $-$ to the image of ρ_s. Hence $\rho_s(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +-+^k = +^k$.
(2) Suppose that $s = n-1$. For $i \leq n-1$, the same reasoning as in the previous case shows that $\rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ is either empty or begins with $+$. It remains to consider $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta})$. Then $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$ (since β is a

proper prefix of α). Then by Lemma 5.22 either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1 0$ or $\beta = \beta_1 \overline{n}$.

(a) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1$. Then $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$, so $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = ++$.
(b) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1 0$. Then $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = -+$, so $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = ++-+ = ++$.
(c) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1 \overline{n}$. Then $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = --$, so $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = ++-- = \varepsilon$.

In each case, $\rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ does not start with $-$ and so $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest weight word.

Since the first symbol of β is 1 and β is a column, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ cannot be 1. Thus neither is the first symbol of $r(\hat{\beta})$, since r can only replace a symbol x with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $r(\hat{\beta})$ and $\ell(\alpha) = \alpha$ (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \alpha$.

Thus by Lemma 5.21 with $\hat{\beta}$ in place of β, $P(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = \gamma$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$ and contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}|$ symbols. Furthermore, since β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{B}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$, neither does $\hat{\beta}$, and so γ contains $1 \cdots s$. Hence $\gamma \preceq \beta_1$ and so $P(\alpha\beta) = \beta_1\gamma$. Since β_1 is a proper prefix of α, it contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.

Finally, since γ contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}|$ symbols, $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}| + |\beta_1| = |\alpha\beta|$ symbols. □

Lemma 5.24 (Two-column lemma for type B_n)**.** *The tableau $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and is either empty or consists of either one column or two columns, the rightmost of which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.*

Proof. If the first symbol of β is 1, then by Lemma 5.23, $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains two columns, contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and its rightmost column contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols. If the first symbol of β is not 1, then by either of the possibilities in Lemma 5.21, $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a column containing at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. □

5.4. D_n**.** Throughout this section, let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{D}_n^*$ be admissible columns such that $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$ and $\alpha\beta$ is of highest weight. As in the previous subsections, our aim is to learn about the shape of $P(\alpha\beta)$. The conclusion, as given in Lemma 5.37, is identical (in statement, not in proof) to the C_n and B_n cases.

Lemma 5.25. *Either $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for some $p \in \mathcal{D}_n[1, n]$, or $\alpha = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, α is a highest weight column (and thus a highest-weight tableau), and thus has the required form by Lemma 4.2. □

In the previous cases A_n, C_n, and B_n, the word α was always of the form $1 \cdots p$. Here, there is the immediate additional complication that alpha could be $1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$.

Lemma 5.26.
(1) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-2$, then the first symbol of β is 1, $p+1$, or $\overline{p}$.*
(2) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots (n-1)$, then the first symbol of β is 1, n, $\overline{n}$, or $\overline{n-1}$.*
(3) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$, then the first symbol of β is 1 or $\overline{n}$.*



FIGURE 12. Roadmap of dependencies of two-column lemmata in case D_n. Lemmata 5.25 and 5.26 give the possibilities for α and the first symbol of β. (The value p lies in $\mathcal{D}_n[1, n-2]$.) Note the much more complicated dependencies between the lemmata, compared with previous types. Lemma 5.37 is the concluding result that gathers all of the information we need.

(4) *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$, then the first symbol of β is 1 or n.*

Proof. Let x be the first symbol of β, so that $\beta = x\beta'$.

(1) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$, where $p \leq n-2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \mathcal{D}_n[2,p] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\ \overbrace{-}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{D}_n[p+2,n] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ \ - \ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n},\overline{p+1}] &\implies \rho_{x}(\alpha\beta) = \ \varepsilon\ \ - \ \rho_{x}(\beta') \ = -\cdots;\\
x \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{p-1},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{x}(\alpha\beta) = +-\ \ - \ \rho_{x}(\beta') \ = -\cdots.
\end{aligned}$$

In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1, $p+1$, or $\overline{p}$.

(2) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots (n-1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x \in \mathcal{D}_n[2,n-1] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\ \overbrace{-}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = -\cdots\\
x \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-2},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = +-\ \ - \ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') \ = -\cdots
\end{aligned}$$

In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1, n, $\overline{n}$, or $\overline{n-1}$.

(3) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \mathcal{D}_n[2,n] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{\ -}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = - \cdots \\ x \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-1},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = +- \ - \ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') = - \cdots \end{aligned}$$

In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1 or $\overline{n}$.

(4) Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \mathcal{D}_n[2,n-1] &\implies \rho_{x-1}(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{\ -}^{x}\ \rho_{x-1}(\beta') = - \cdots \\ x \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n},\overline{1}] &\implies \rho_{\overline{x}}(\alpha\beta) = +- \ - \ \rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta') = - \cdots \end{aligned}$$

In each case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are that x is 1 or n. □

The next step will be to analyze what happens in the cases 1–4 in Lemma 5.26 when the first symbol of β is not 1. As will be shown, in each situation $P(\alpha\beta)$ is a single column that contains no more than $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols.

First we consider one of the possibilities arising from cases 1 and 2 of Lemma 5.26. The case where the first symbol of β is $\overline{p}$ is easier:

Lemma 5.27. *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ for $p \leq n-1$ and the first symbol of β is $\overline{p}$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single admissible column that is a prefix of α. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q},\overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.*

Proof. (The reader may wish to refer to Figure 8, which illustrates this proof when symbols C are replaced by D throughout.) The word β is a column and so consists of symbols $\overline{x_1}\,\overline{x_2} \ldots \overline{x_k}$ with $1 \leq x_k < x_{k-1} < \ldots < x_1 = p$. (Note that β does not include symbols n or $\overline{n}$.) Thus by Lemma 4.5, $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a column containing fewer that $p = |\alpha|$ symbols, and, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q},\overline{1}]$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$. Since $\alpha\beta$ is of highest weight, so is $P(\alpha\beta)$. Thus, if it is non-empty, it is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$ or $1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$. Since it contains fewer than $p \leq n-1$ symbols, it is thus a prefix of $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$. □

The next step is to consider cases 3 and 4 of Lemma 5.26, because some of the other possibilities can be reduced to this situation. For case 3, the method is to characterize β in Lemma 5.28 and then prove the result in Lemma 5.29:

Lemma 5.28. *If $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$ and the first symbol of β is $\overline{n}$, then either $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k\overline{n-1}\gamma$ for some $k \geq 0$ and a (possibly empty) strictly increasing word γ over $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-2},\overline{1}]$, or $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k$, or $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k n$.*

Proof. Since β is a column of type D_n and the first symbol of β is $\overline{n}$, then $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})\beta'$ for some maximal $k \geq 0$ and β' a (possibly empty) word over $\mathcal{D}_n[n,\overline{1}]$.

Suppose first that $\beta' = \overline{x}\gamma$, where $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-2},\overline{1}]$. Then

$$\rho_x(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{\ \varepsilon\ }^{\overline{n}}\overbrace{\ (\varepsilon)^k\ }^{(n\overline{n})^k}\overbrace{\ -}^{\overline{x}}\ \rho_x(\gamma) = - \cdots,$$

which contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. So if β' is non-empty, it either has the form $\overline{n-1}\gamma$ or $n\gamma$. It remains to show that γ must be empty in the latter case.

Suppose that $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k n\overline{x}\gamma'$ where k is maximal for some $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n}, \overline{1}]$ and $\gamma = \overline{x}\gamma'$. Since k is maximal, $\overline{x} \neq \overline{n}$, so $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$. However,

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{x} \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-2}, \overline{1}] \implies \quad \rho_x(\alpha\beta) &= \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\ \overbrace{\varepsilon}^{\overline{n}}\ \overbrace{(\varepsilon)^k}^{(n\overline{n})^k}\ \overbrace{\varepsilon}^{n}\ \overbrace{-}^{\overline{x}}\ \rho_x(\gamma') &&= -\cdots;\\
\overline{x} = \overline{n-1} \implies \rho_{n-1}(\alpha\beta) &= +-\ +\ (-+)^k\ -\ -\ \rho_{n-1}(\gamma') &&= -\cdots.
\end{aligned}$$

In either case, this contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. □

Lemma 5.29. *If $\alpha = 1\cdots n$ and the first symbol of β is $\overline{n}$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix (not necessarily proper) of α. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq n-1$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$.*

Proof. (See Figure 13.) By Lemma 5.28, there are three cases. If $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k\overline{n-1}\gamma$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha\beta &= 1\cdots n\overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k\overline{n-1}\gamma\\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1\cdots(n-1)(n\overline{n})^k\overline{n-1}\gamma && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n})\\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1\cdots(n-1)(n\overline{n})^{k-1}\overline{n-1}\gamma && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n})\\
&\ \ \vdots\\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n-1}\gamma, && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n})
\end{aligned}$$

which, by Lemma 4.5, is equal to either the empty word or to a single column that is a prefix of α. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$ (which can only happen for $q \leq n-2$ since β contains $\overline{n}$ and $\overline{n-1}$), then neither does γ, and so $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$ by Lemma 4.5.

If $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha\beta &= 1\cdots n\overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k\\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1\cdots(n-1)(n\overline{n})^k && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n})\\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1\cdots(n-1)(n\overline{n})^{k-1} && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n})\\
&\ \ \vdots\\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1\cdots(n-1), && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n})
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$ for any $q \leq n-1$.



FIGURE 13. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.29. The column β has the form of an alternating sequence of $\overline{n}$ and n, which is followed by $\overline{n-1}\gamma$ (for some γ, possibly empty), or ends with $\overline{n}$, or ends with n. In the second and third cases, the columns concatenate to form a non-admissible column, which then becomes admissible through application of relations $\mathcal{R}_5^{D_n}$. In the first case, such applications leave us with a column $1 \cdots n-1$ concatenated with a column beginning $\overline{n-1}$, so Lem. 5.27 applies. The greyed $\overline{q}$ indicates a symbol that is not contained in β, and so q 'survives' in $P(\alpha\beta)$.

Finally, if $\beta = \overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k n$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha\beta &= 1 \cdots n\overline{n}(n\overline{n})^k n \\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1 \cdots (n-1)(n\overline{n})^k n && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n}) \\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1 \cdots (n-1)(n\overline{n})^{k-1} n && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n}) \\
&\;\;\vdots \\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} 1 \cdots (n-1)n, && (\text{by } \mathcal{R}_5^{D_n}) \\
&= \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$ for any $q \leq n-1$. □

The method for case 4 of Lemma 5.26 is parallel: characterize β in Lemma 5.30 and then prove the result in Lemma 5.31:

Lemma 5.30. *If $\alpha = 1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n}$ and the first symbol of β is n, then either $\beta = n(\overline{n}n)^k\overline{n-1}\gamma$ for some $k \geq 0$ and a (possibly empty) strictly increasing word γ over $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-2}, \overline{1}]$, or $\beta = n(\overline{n}n)^k$, or $\beta = n(\overline{n}n)^k\overline{n}$.*

Proof. Parallel to the proof of Lemma 5.28, except that one considers

$$\overline{x} = \overline{n-1} \implies \rho_n(\alpha\beta) = \overbrace{+-}^{\alpha}\overbrace{+}^{n}\overbrace{(-+)^k}^{(\overline{n}n)^k}\overbrace{-}^{\overline{n}}\overbrace{-}^{\overline{x}}\rho_x(\gamma) = -\cdots$$

to get a contradiction in the case $\overline{x} = \overline{n-1}$. □

Lemma 5.31. *If $\alpha = 1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n}$ and the first symbol of β is n, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix (not necessarily proper) of α. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq n-1$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$.*

Proof. Parallel to the proof of Lemma 5.29, using Lemma 5.30, and noting that when $\beta = n(\overline{n}n)^k\overline{n}$, we get $P(\alpha\beta) = 1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n} = \alpha$. □

Finally, for case 2 of Lemma 5.26, we can reduce all sub-cases to previously-proven results:

Lemma 5.32. *If $\alpha = 1\cdots(n-1)$ and the first symbol of β is n, $\overline{n}$, or $\overline{n-1}$ then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of either $1\cdots n$ or $1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n}$ that contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq n-1$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1\cdots q$.*

Proof. (See Figure 14.) If the first symbol of β is $\overline{n-1}$, then the result follows from Lemma 5.27.

So suppose $\beta = x\hat{\beta}$, where x is n or $\overline{n}$. Let $\hat{\alpha} = 1\cdots(n-1)x$. Then $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are admissable columns and $\alpha\beta = \hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}$. The first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ cannot be 1. Thus neither is the first symbol of $r(\hat{\beta})$, since r can only replace a symbol x with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $r(\hat{\beta})$ and $\ell(\hat{\alpha}) = \hat{\alpha}$ (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \hat{\alpha}$.

If $x = n$, then case 3 of Lemma 5.26 holds with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in place of α and β and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is $\overline{n}$ and so the result follows from Lemma 5.29 with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in place of α and β, since $P(\alpha\beta) = P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ and $\hat{\alpha} = 1\cdots n$, noting in particular that $|\hat{\alpha}| \leq |\alpha\beta|$.

If $x = \overline{n}$, then case 4 of Lemma 5.26 holds with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in place of α and β and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is n and so the result follows from Lemma 5.31 with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in place of α and β, since $P(\alpha\beta) = P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ and $\hat{\alpha} = 1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n}$, noting in particular that $|\hat{\alpha}| \leq |\alpha\beta|$. □

In a slight variation on previous subsections, let β_1 be the maximal prefix of β whose symbols form an interval of $\mathcal{D}_n[1, n-1]$ (viewed as an ordered set).



FIGURE 14. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.32. There are three possibilities for the first symbol x of β: it can be $\overline{n-1}$, n, or $\overline{n}$. In the first case, Lemma 5.27 applies immediately. In the second and third cases, we define $\hat{\alpha}$ to be αx, and define $\hat{\beta}$ to be the remainder of β. (Essentially, we move x from the top of the left column to the bottom of the right column, which does not alter the reading of the tabloid.) Then Lemma 5.26 tells us about the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$, and then Lemmata 5.29 and 5.31 apply. In each case, the greyed $\overline{q}$ indicates a symbol that is not contained in β, and so q 'survives' in $P(\alpha\beta)$.

Now we consider another possibility arising from case 1 of Lemma 5.26, where the first symbol of β is $p+1$:

Lemma 5.33. *Suppose $\alpha = 1 \cdots p$ and $\beta_1 = (p+1) \cdots t$ for $p < t \leq n-1$. Let $\hat{\beta}$ be such that $\beta = \beta_1 \hat{\beta}$.*

(1) *If $\hat{\beta} = \varepsilon$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots t$.*
(2) *If $\hat{\beta} \neq \varepsilon$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of either $1 \cdots n$ or $1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$ and contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.*

Proof. If $\hat{\beta} = \varepsilon$, then $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots p(p+1) \cdots t$, which is an admissible column.

So assume that $\hat{\beta} \neq \varepsilon$. Let $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots (p+1)p \cdots t = 1 \cdots t$. Note that $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta} = \alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta} = \alpha\beta$ and so $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}$ has highest weight. The words $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are also admissible columns, and the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is certainly not 1. Thus neither is the first symbol of $r(\hat{\beta})$, since r can only replace a symbol x

with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $r(\hat{\beta})$ and $\ell(\hat{\alpha}) = \hat{\alpha}$ (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \hat{\alpha}$.

Thus Lemma 5.26 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and t in place of α, β, and p, respectively. Consider the cases that can arise:

(1) If $t \leq n-2$, case 1 of Lemma 5.26 holds and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is either 1, $t+1$, or $\overline{t}$. As noted above, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is not 1. By the maximality of the prefix β_1, the symbol $t+1$ (which is less than or equal to $n-1$) is not in β and thus cannot be the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$. Therefore the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is $\overline{t}$, and so Lemma 5.27 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and t in place of α, β, and p, respectively, to show that $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ is a proper prefix of $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha\beta_1 = 1 \cdots t$ containing fewer that $|\hat{\alpha}|$ symbols. Note also that, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, then neither does $\hat{\beta}$ and so in this case $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ must contain $1 \cdots q$. Since $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}) = P(\alpha\beta)$ and $|\hat{\alpha}| = |\alpha\beta_1| \leq |\alpha\beta|$, the result follows.

(2) If $t = n-1$, case 2 of Lemma 5.26 holds and so the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is either 1, n, $\overline{n}$, or $\overline{n-1}$. As noted above, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ is not 1. So Lemma 5.32 applies with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ in place of α and β, respectively, to show that $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ is a prefix of $1 \cdots n$ or $1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$ that contains at most $|\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}|$ symbols. Note also that, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, then neither does $\hat{\beta}$ and so in this case $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})$ must contain $1 \cdots q$. Since $P(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}) = P(\alpha\beta)$ and $|\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}| = |\alpha\beta|$, the result follows. □

Lemma 5.34. *Suppose the first symbol of β is not 1. If $\beta = \beta_1$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ is the column $\alpha\beta$; otherwise $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of either $1 \cdots n$ or $1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$ and contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. Furthermore, if β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{q}, \overline{1}]$, where $q \leq p$, then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains $1 \cdots q$.*

Proof. One of the four cases of Lemma 5.26 holds, with the first symbol of β not being 1:

(1) In case 1, the result follows from Lemmata 5.27 and 5.33.
(2) In case 2, the result follows from Lemma 5.32.
(3) In case 3, the result follows from Lemma 5.29.
(4) In case 4, the result follows from Lemma 5.31. □

Finally, it remains to consider what happens when the first symbol of β is 1.

Lemma 5.35. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then β_1 is a proper prefix of α. Furthermore, if $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$, then:*

(1) *if $s < n-1$, then the symbol $s+1$ and symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$ are not in β;*
(2) *if $s = n-1$ and $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$, then either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$, and so symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$ are not in β;*
(3) *if $s = n-1$ and $\alpha = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$, then either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1 n$, and so symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$ are not in β.*



FIGURE 15. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.36 (where β begins with 1). The prefix β_1 of β is a proper prefix $1 \cdots s$ of α by Lemma 5.35, and $\overline{s}$ and subsequent symbols are not in β. The column β_1 thus commutes past α by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4. The two left-hand columns are now α and $\hat{\beta}$ (which does not begin with 1 or contain $\overline{s}$ or any subsequent symbol), and thus we can apply Lemma 5.34 in the case where β does not begin with 1, but using $\hat{\beta}$ in place of β; this shows that s 'survives' in the leftmost column of $P(\alpha\beta)$.

Proof. Since the first symbol of β is 1, we have $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$ for some $s \leq n-1$.

Suppose $s < n-1$. Then $s+1$ is not a symbol of β_1 since β_1 has maximal length, and so all other symbols of β are strictly greater than $s+1$; hence $s+1$ is not a symbol of β. Furthermore, if $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$, then $\overline{x}$ is not a symbol of β, since otherwise $N_\beta(x) = x + 1 > x$, contradicting β being admissible.

Suppose that $s = n-1$ and $\alpha = 1 \cdots n$. Then β cannot contain any symbol $\overline{x}$ from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$, for this would imply $N_\beta(x) > x$, contradicting β being admissible. So, since the length of an admissible column is bounded by n, we have $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$ or $\beta = \beta_1 n$. The last possibility cannot arise since $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$.

The reasoning for $s = n-1$ and $\alpha = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$ parallels the previous paragraph. □

Lemma 5.36. *Suppose the first symbol of β is 1. Then $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains two columns, contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and its rightmost column is β_1, which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.*

Proof. (See Figure 15.) Let $\hat{\beta}$ be such that $\beta = \beta_1\hat{\beta}$. By Lemma 5.35, $\beta_1 = 1 \cdots s$ is a proper prefix of α. So $\alpha\beta_1 =_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} \beta_1\alpha$ by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4 and so $\alpha\beta = \alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)} \beta_1\alpha\hat{\beta}$.

We now aim to show that $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest-weight word. We have to consider several cases:

(1) Suppose that $s < n-1$. Then for $i < s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = +- = \varepsilon$, and for $i > s$, we have $\rho_i(\beta_1) = \varepsilon$. Hence if $i \neq s$, we have $\rho_i(\alpha\beta_1\hat{\beta}) = \rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$. Furthermore, $\rho_s(\hat{\beta}) = +^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, since $\hat{\beta}$ does not contain the symbols $s+1$ or $\overline{s}$ by Lemma 5.35, and

these are the only symbols that could contribute $-$ to the image of ρ_s. Hence $\rho_s(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +-+^k = +^k\cdots$.

(2) Suppose that $s = n-1$. For $i < n-1$, the same reasoning as in the previous case shows that $\rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ is either empty or begins with $+$. It remains to consider $\rho_{n-1}(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ and $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta})$. Then either $\alpha = 1\cdots n$ or $\alpha = 1\cdots n-1\overline{n}$ (since β is a proper prefix of α). Then:

(a) Suppose that $\alpha = 1\cdots n$, so that $\rho_{n-1}(\alpha) = +- = \varepsilon$ and $\rho_n(\alpha) = ++ = \varepsilon$. Then by Lemma 5.35 either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$.

(i) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1$. Then $\rho_{n-1}(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$ and $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$, so $\rho_{n-1}(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$ and $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = ++$.

(ii) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1\overline{n}$. Then $\rho_{n-1}(\hat{\beta}) = +$ and $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = -$ and so $\rho_{n-1}(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +$ and $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = ++- = +$.

(b) Suppose that $\alpha = 1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n}$, so that $\rho_{n-1}(\alpha) = ++$ and $\rho_n(\alpha) = +- = \varepsilon$. Then by Lemma 5.35 either $\beta = \beta_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1 n$.

(i) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1$. Then $\rho_{n-1}(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$ and $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$, so $\rho_{n-1}(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = ++$ and $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = \varepsilon$.

(ii) Suppose $\beta = \beta_1 n$. Then $\rho_{n-1}(\hat{\beta}) = -$ and $\rho_n(\hat{\beta}) = +$ and so $\rho_{n-1}(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = ++- = +$ and $\rho_n(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = +$.

In each case, $\rho_i(\alpha\hat{\beta})$ does not start with $-$ and so $\alpha\hat{\beta}$ is a highest weight word.

Since the first symbol of β is 1 and β is a column, the first symbol of $\hat{\beta}$ cannot be 1. Thus neither is the first symbol of $r(\hat{\beta})$, since r can only replace a symbol x with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence the first row of the tabloid with columns $r(\hat{\beta})$ and $\ell(\alpha) = \alpha$ (in that order) has a strict decrease in its first row, and thus $\hat{\beta} \not\preceq \alpha$.

Thus by Lemma 5.34 with $\hat{\beta}$ in place of β, the tableau $P(\alpha\hat{\beta}) = \gamma$ is either empty or a single column that is a prefix of either $1\cdots n$ or $1\cdots(n-1)\overline{n}$ and contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}|$ symbols. Furthermore, since β does not contain symbols from $\mathcal{D}_n[\overline{s}, \overline{1}]$, neither does $\hat{\beta}$, and so γ contains $1\cdots s$. Hence $\beta_1 \preceq \gamma$ and so $P(\alpha\beta) = \beta_1\gamma$. Since β_1 is a proper prefix of α, it contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.

Finally, since γ contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}|$ symbols, $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains at most $|\alpha\hat{\beta}| + |\beta_1| = |\alpha\beta|$ symbols. □

Lemma 5.37 (Two-column lemma for type D_n)**.** *The tableau $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and is either empty or consists of either one column or two columns, the rightmost of which contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.*

Proof. If the first symbol of β is 1, then by Lemma 5.36, $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains two columns, contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and its rightmost column contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols. If the first symbol of β is not 1, then by either of the possibilities in Lemma 5.34, $P(\alpha\beta)$ is either empty or a column containing at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols. □

5.5. G_2**.** Let α and β be admissible G_2 column words such that $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$ and $\alpha\beta$ is a highest-weight word. As in the previous subsections, our aim is to learn about the shape of $P(\alpha\beta)$; for the conclusion, see Lemma 5.39. However, the approach is different. Recall that there are only finitely many admissible G_2 columns (the admissible G_2 columns are listed in (4.1), and the relation $\preceq$ on admisible G_2 columns is illustrated in Figure 3). Thus, our approach is simply to characterize the finitely many possibilities for α and β in Lemma 5.38, and then to compute $P(\alpha\beta)$ in each case and derive the conclusion in Lemma 5.39.

Lemma 5.38. *Either:*

(1) $\alpha = 1$ *and* $\beta \in \{2, 0, \overline{1}, 23, 00\}$*; or*
(2) $\alpha = 12$ *and* $\beta \in \{1, 3, \overline{2}, 13, 30, 3\overline{3}, \overline{21}\}$.

Proof. Since $\alpha\beta$ is of highest weight Lemma 2.3, α is a highest weight column (and thus a highest-weight tableau). The highest weight admissible columns of lengths 1 and 2 are 1 and 12, so either $\alpha = 1$ or $\alpha = 12$.

(1) Suppose $\alpha = 1$. Let $\beta = x\beta'$, where $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$. If $x = 1$, then $\beta \preceq \alpha$, which is a contradiction. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
x = 3 &\implies \rho_2(\alpha\beta) = \rho_2(13\beta') = -\rho_2(\beta') = -\cdots; \\
x = \overline{3} &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(1\overline{3}\beta') = +-\!-\rho_1(\beta') = -\cdots; \\
x = \overline{2} &\implies \rho_2(\alpha\beta) = \rho_2(1\overline{2}\beta') = -\rho_2(\beta') = -\cdots.
\end{aligned}$$

In each case, the supposition contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. So x must be 2, 0, or $\overline{1}$; if $|\beta| = 1$, these are the possibilities for β.

Suppose now that $|\beta| = 2$. This cannot occur when $x = \overline{1}$, for no admissible column begins with $\overline{1}$. The admissible column words of length 2 beginning with 2 and 0 are 23, 20, $2\overline{3}$, and 00, $0\overline{3}$ and $0\overline{2}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta = 20 &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(120) = +-\!-+ = -+, \\
\beta = 2\overline{3} &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(12\overline{3}) = +--- = --, \\
\beta = 0\overline{3} &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(10\overline{3}) = +-+-\!- = -, \\
\beta = 0\overline{2} &\implies \rho_2(\alpha\beta) = \rho_2(10\overline{2}) = -,
\end{aligned}$$

each of which contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities are $\beta = 23$ and $\beta = 00$.

(2) Suppose $\alpha = 12$. Let $\beta = x\beta'$, where $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x = 2 &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(122\beta') = +-\!-\rho_1(\beta') = -\cdots, \\
x = 0 &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(120\beta') = +-\!-+\rho_1(\beta') = -+\cdots, \\
x = \overline{3} &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(12\overline{3}\beta') = +---\rho_1(\beta') = --\cdots, \\
x = \overline{1} &\implies \rho_1(\alpha\beta) = \rho_1(12\overline{1}\beta') = +-\!-\rho_1(\beta') = -\cdots,
\end{aligned}$$

each of which contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. So x must be 1, 3, or $\overline{2}$. If $|\beta| = 1$, these are the possibilities for β.

Suppose now that $|\beta| = 2$. The admissible column words of length 2 beginning with 1, 3, and $\overline{2}$ are 12, 13, 30, $3\overline{3}$, $3\overline{2}$, $\overline{21}$. Note first

TABLE 1. Case analysis for the proof of Lemma 5.39.

Shape of β | α	α	β	*Defining relations applied*	$P(\alpha\beta)$	*Shape of* $P(\alpha\beta)$
⬚⬚	1	2	—	12	⬚ ⬚
⬚⬚	1	0	$10 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 1$	1	▫
⬚⬚	1	$\overline{1}$	$1\overline{1} =_{\mathcal{R}_2^{G_2}} \varepsilon$	ε	
⬚⬚ ⬚	1	23	$123 =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 110 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 11$	11	⬚⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚	1	00	$100 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 10 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 1$	1	▫
⬚⬚ ⬚	12	1	$121 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 112$	112	⬚⬚ ⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚	12	3	$123 =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 110 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 11$	11	⬚⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚	12	$\overline{2}$	$12\overline{2} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 10 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 1$	1	▫
⬚⬚ ⬚⬚	12	13	$1213 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 1123 =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 1110 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 111$	111	⬚⬚⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚⬚	12	30	$1230 =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 1100 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 110 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 11$	11	⬚⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚⬚	12	$3\overline{3}$	$123\overline{3} =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 110\overline{3} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 11\overline{3} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 12$	12	⬚ ⬚
⬚⬚ ⬚⬚	12	$\overline{21}$	$12\overline{21} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 10\overline{1} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 1\overline{1} =_{\mathcal{R}_2^{G_2}} \varepsilon$	ε	

that $\beta \neq 12$ since $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$. Furthermore

$$\beta = 3\overline{2} \implies \rho_2(\alpha\beta) = \rho_2(123\overline{2}) = +-- = -,$$

which contradicts $\alpha\beta$ being of highest weight. The remaining possibilities for β are 13, 30, $3\overline{3}$, and $\overline{21}$. □

Lemma 5.39 (Two-column lemma for type G_2)**.** *Either $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains fewer that $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, or else has only one column, or else its rightmost column contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols.*

Proof. Using Lemma 5.38, we will systematically enumerate the possible words $\alpha\beta$ and calculate their corresponding tableaux. The results are show in Table 1.

In each case, we get a tableau that contains fewer that $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols (and that is in some case empty), and in the cases when the number of symbols in the tableau is equal to $|\alpha\beta|$, either the tableau contains only one column, or else contains two columns and the number of symbols in the rightmost column is less than $|\alpha|$. □

6. Constructing the rewriting system

We now turn to actually constructing the finite complete rewriting systems presenting $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$, $\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)$, $\mathrm{Pl}(C_n)$, $\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)$, and $\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)$. The constructions can be carried out in parallel, because the only differences are the apeals to the different lemmata from Section 5. We first of all recall the necessary definitions about rewriting systems in Subsection 6.1; for further background, see [BO93] or [BN98]. For background on semigroup presentations generally, see [Rušˇ95] or [Hig92].

6.1. **Preliminaries.** Let $\leq$ be a total order on an alphabet A. Define a total order $\leq_{\mathrm{lex}}$ on A^* by $w \leq_{\mathrm{lex}} w'$ if and only if either w is proper prefix of w' or if $w = paq$, $w' = pbr$ and $a \leq b$ for some $p, q, r \in A^*$, and $a, b \in A$. The order $\leq_{\mathrm{lex}}$ is the *lexicographic order induced by* $\leq$. Notice that $\leq_{\mathrm{lex}}$ is not a well-order, but that it is left compatible with concatenation. Define also a total order $\leq_{\mathrm{lenlex}}$ on A^* by

$$w \leq_{\mathrm{lenlex}} w' \iff (|w| < |w'|) \vee \big((|w| = |w'|) \wedge (w \leq_{\mathrm{lex}} w')\big).$$

The order $\leq_{\mathrm{lenlex}}$ is the *length-plus-lexicographic order induced by* $\leq$. The order $\leq_{\mathrm{lenlex}}$ is a well-order and is left compatible with concatenation.

A *string rewriting system*, or simply a *rewriting system*, is a pair (A, R), where A is a finite alphabet and R is a set of pairs (ℓ, r), usually written $\ell \to r$, known as *rewriting rules* or simply *rules*, drawn from $A^* \times A^*$. The single reduction relation $\to_R$ is defined as follows: $u \to_R v$ (where $u, v \in A^*$) if there exists a rewriting rule $(\ell, r) \in R$ and words $x, y \in A^*$ such that $u = x\ell y$ and $v = xry$. That is, $u \to_R v$ if one can obtain v from u by substituting the word r for a subword ℓ of u, where $\ell \to r$ is a rewriting rule. The reduction relation $\to_R^*$ is the reflexive and transitive closure of $\to_R$. The process of replacing a subword ℓ by a word r, where $\ell \to r$ is a rule, is called *reduction* by application of the rule $\ell \to r$; the iteration of this process is also called reduction. A word $w \in A^*$ is *reducible* if it contains a subword ℓ that forms the left-hand side of a rewriting rule in R; it is otherwise called *irreducible*.

The rewriting system (A, R) is *finite* if both A and R are finite. The rewriting system (A, R) is *noetherian* if there is no infinite sequence $u_1, u_2, \ldots \in A^*$ such that $u_i \to_R u_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. That is, (A, R) is noetherian if any process of reduction must eventually terminate with an irreducible word. The rewriting system (A, R) is *confluent* if, for any words $u, u', u'' \in A^*$ with $u \to_R^* u'$ and $u \to_R^* u''$, there exists a word $v \in A^*$ such that $u' \to_R^* v$ and $u'' \to_R^* v$. A rewriting system that is both confluent and noetherian is *complete*. If (A, R) is a complete rewriting system, then for every word u there is a unique irreducible word w such that $u \to_R^* w$; this word is called the *normal form* of u. If (A, R) is complete, then the language of normal form words forms a cross-section of the monoid: that is, each element of the monoid presented by $\langle A \mid R \rangle$ has a unique normal form representive.

6.2. **Construction.** Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2, and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding alphabet from $\mathcal{A}_n$, $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$, $\mathcal{D}_n$, or $\mathcal{G}_2$. Let

$$\Sigma = \{\, c_\sigma : \sigma \text{ is an admissible } X \text{ column} \,\}.$$

Note that Σ is finite since there are finitely many admissible X columns.

Let T consist of the following rewriting rules:

(6.1) $c_\sigma c_\tau \to \varepsilon$ $\quad \tau \not\preceq \sigma$ and $P(\sigma\tau)$ is empty,

(6.2) $c_\sigma c_\tau \to c_\upsilon$ $\quad \tau \not\preceq \sigma$ and $P(\sigma\tau)$ is the 1-col. tableau $\boxed{\upsilon}$,

(6.3) $c_\sigma c_\tau \to c_\upsilon c_\phi$ $\quad \tau \not\preceq \sigma$ and $P(\sigma\tau)$ is the 2-col. tableau $\boxed{\phi}\boxed{\upsilon}$,

(6.4) $c_\sigma c_\tau \to c_\upsilon c_\phi c_\chi$ $\quad \tau \not\preceq \sigma$ and $P(\sigma\tau)$ is the 3-col. tableau $\boxed{\chi}\boxed{\phi}\boxed{\upsilon}$.

Note that since $P(\sigma\tau)$ is a tableau, the subscripts υ, ϕ, and χ are always admissible columns.

Note that if σ, τ are admissible columns with $\tau \not\preceq \sigma$, then $P(\sigma\tau)$ has at most three columns by Lemmata 5.7, 5.15, 5.24, 5.37, and 5.39 (that is, by the two-column lemmata for types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2). Thus every such pair of columns gives rise to a rewriting rule in T. (Note that rules of the form $c_\sigma c_\tau \to c_\upsilon c_\phi c_\chi$ only arise when $X = G_2$, because $P(\sigma\tau)$ has at most two columns in the other cases.) Finally, note that T is finite since there are finitely many possibilities for σ and τ, and the right-hand side of each rule is uniquely determined by the left-hand side.

The idea is that a word $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ corresponds to the tabloid $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$, and that if this tabloid is not a tableau, then there are two adjacent columns between which the relation $\preceq$ does not hold. These columns (as represented by some subword $c_\sigma c_\tau$ with $\tau \not\preceq \sigma$) are rewritten to a tableau (as represented by a word in Σ^*). Thus, in terms of words in Σ^*, tabloids are rewritten to become more 'tableau-like', and the irreducible words correspond to tableaux.

Lemma 6.1. *The rewriting system (Σ, T) is noetherian.*

Proof. Let $\trianglelefteq$ be any total order on Σ that extends the partial order induced by lengths of columns, in the sense that $|\sigma| \leq |\tau| \implies c_\sigma \trianglelefteq c_\tau$ for any two admissible columns σ and τ.

Let the map $L : \Sigma^* \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ send each word to the sum of the lengths of the subscripts of its symbols: that is,

$$L\big(c_{\sigma^{(1)}} c_{\sigma^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\sigma^{(h)}}\big) = \sum_{i=1}^{h} |\sigma^{(i)}|.$$

Define a total order $\sqsubset$ on Σ^* by

$$u \sqsubset v \iff \big(L(u) < L(v)\big) \vee \Big(\big(L(u) = L(v)\big) \wedge \big(u \trianglelefteq_{\text{lenlex}} v\big)\Big).$$

That is, $\sqsubset$ first orders by the total number of symbols in the tabloid to which a word corresponds, then by the length of the word, and then lexicographically based on the ordering $\trianglelefteq$ of Σ.

Let $c_\sigma c_\tau$ be the left-hand side of a rewriting rule and let w be its right-hand side. So $\tau \not\preceq \sigma$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{X}^*$ be such that $|\alpha| = |\sigma|$ and $|\beta| = |\tau|$ and $\alpha\beta$ is the highest-weight word in the crystal component of $\sigma\tau$. Then α and β are admissible columns with $\beta \not\preceq \alpha$ by Lemma 4.1. So for $X = A_n$ (respectively, B_n, C_n, D_n, G_2), Lemma 5.7 (respectively, 5.24, 5.15, 5.37, 5.39) shows that $P(\alpha\beta)$ contains at most $|\alpha\beta|$ symbols, and consists of at most three columns, and if it contains more than one column, the rightmost column contains fewer than $|\alpha|$ symbols. Since $P(\sigma\tau)$ has the same shape as $P(\alpha\beta)$ by Lemma 4.1, it follows that $|w| \leq 3$, that $L(w) \leq L(c_\sigma c_\tau)$, and that if $L(w) = L(c_\sigma c_\tau)$ then either $|w| = 1$ or $w \trianglelefteq_{\text{lenlex}} c_\sigma c_\tau$ (since the leftmost symbol of w has a subscript of length less than $|\sigma| = |\alpha|$ in the case $|w| > 1$). That is, an application of a rewriting rule must decrease a word either with respect to $L(\cdot)$ or with respect to $\trianglelefteq_{\text{lenlex}}$.

Thus rewriting a word always decreases it with respect to $\sqsubset$. Since there are no infinite $\sqsubset$-descending chains, any process of rewriting must terminate. Hence (Σ, T) is noetherian. □

Lemma 6.2. *The rewriting system (Σ, T) is confluent.*

Proof. Let $u \in \Sigma^*$ and let u' and u'' be words with $u \to^* u'$ and $u \to^* u''$. By Lemma 6.1, there are irreducible words $w' = c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k)}}$ and $w'' = c_{\gamma^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\gamma^{(m)}} \in \Sigma^*$ such that $u' \to^* w'$ and $u'' \to^* w''$. Since w' is irreducible, it does not contain the left-hand side of any rule in T. Thus, by the comments after the definition of T, we have $\beta^{(j+1)} \preceq \beta^{(j)}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k-1$. That is, $\boxed{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a tableau. Similarly, $\boxed{\gamma^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\gamma^{(1)}}$ is a tableau (with m columns). But the readings of these tableau (that is, $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(k)}$ and $\gamma^{(1)} \cdots \gamma^{(m)}$) are equal in $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$, and tableaux form a cross-section of $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$ by Theorem 4.3 . Hence $k = m$ and $\beta^{(j)} = \gamma^{(j)}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$, and so $w' = w''$. Thus $v = w' = w''$ is a word such that $u' \to^* v$ and $u'' \to^* v$. Therefore (Σ, T) is confluent. □

Theorem 6.3. *For any $X \in \{A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, G_2\}$, there is a finite complete rewriting system (Σ, T) that presents* $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$.

Proof. Construct the finite complete rewriting system (Σ, T) as above. It remains to prove that $\langle \Sigma \,|\, T \rangle$ presents $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$. To this end, let $\langle \mathcal{X} \,|\, \mathcal{R}^X \rangle$ be the presentation for $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$ from Subsection 4.3. We are going to prove that $\langle \Sigma \,|\, T \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{X} \,|\, \mathcal{R}^X \rangle$ present the same monoid.

First notice that if $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k$ is an admissible column, where $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{X}$, then a sequence of applications of rules from T of type (6.2) lead from $c_{\sigma_1} \cdots c_{\sigma_k}$ to $c_{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k}$:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\sigma_1} c_{\sigma_2} c_{\sigma_3} \cdots c_{\sigma_{k-1}} c_{\sigma_k} &\to_T c_{\sigma_1\sigma_2} c_{\sigma_3} \cdots c_{\sigma_{k-1}} c_{\sigma_k} \\ &\vdots \\ &\to_T c_{\sigma_1\sigma_2\cdots\sigma_{k-1}} c_{\sigma_k} \\ &\to_T c_{\sigma_1\sigma_2\cdots\sigma_{k-1}\sigma_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can apply Tietze transformations to $\langle \Sigma \,|\, T \rangle$ to replace each symbol $c_{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k}$ with $c_{\sigma_1} \cdots c_{\sigma_k}$ and then remove the generators $c_{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k}$ with $k > 1$. The result of this is a new presentation $\langle \Sigma' \,|\, T' \rangle$ where the generating symbols in Σ' are c_x for $x \in \mathcal{X}$, so we can replace each c_x by x to obtain a new presentation $\langle \mathcal{X} \,|\, T'' \rangle$. It remains to show that every defining relation in T'' is a consequence of those in $\mathcal{R}^X$ and vice versa.

Note that T'' can be obtained from T by replacing each symbol $c_{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k}$ by $\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k$. Thus every defining relation in T'' is of the form (u, v), where u is the reading of a two-column tabloid and v is the reading of a tableau, and $u =_{\mathrm{Pl}(X)} v$. Since $\langle \mathcal{X} \,|\, \mathcal{R}^X \rangle$ presents $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$, the defining relation (u, v) is a consequence of $\mathcal{R}^X$.

On the other hand, let (u, v) be a defining relation in $\mathcal{R}^X$. By inspection of the definition of $\mathcal{R}^X$ in Subsection 4.3, v is the reading of a tableau, and $P(u) = v$. Suppose this tableau is $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$, where $\beta^{(1)}$, …, $\beta^{(m)}$ are admissible columns of type X. Suppose $u = u_1 \cdots u_t$, and note that every symbol u_i is an admissible column of type X. Since $P(u) = v$, the word

$c_{u_1} \cdots c_{u_t}$ rewrites to $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ under the rewriting system (Σ, T). Fix a sequence of rewriting $c_{u_1} \cdots c_{u_t} \to_T^* c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$. Replacing each symbol $c_{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k}$ by $\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k$ throughout this sequence of rewriting yields a sequence from $u = u_1 \cdots u_t$ to $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} = v$ where every step is an application of a relation from T''. Hence (u, v) is a consequence of T''.

Since every defining relation in T'' is a consequence of those in $\mathcal{R}^X$ and vice versa, $\langle \mathcal{X} \mid T'' \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{X} \mid \mathcal{R}^X \rangle$ present the same monoid, and thus $\langle \Sigma \mid T \rangle$ presents $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$. □

The following corollary is immediate [SOK94]:

Corollary 6.4. *Plactic monoids of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2 have finite derivation type.*

By a result originally proved by Anick in a different form [Ani86], but also proved by various other authors (see [Bro92, Coh97]):

Corollary 6.5. *Plactic monoids of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2 are of type right and left* FP_∞.

7. Biautomaticity lemmata

In this section, we lay the groundwork for constructing biautomatic structures for plactic monoids in Section 8.

The language of representatives of the biautomatic structure will be the language of irreducible words of the rewriting system (Σ, T) constructed in Section 6. To prove that this gives us a biautomatic structure, we must understand how products of the form $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}}$ and $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}} c_x$ rewrite, where $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}}$ is an irreducible word and $c_x \in \Sigma$ is such that $|x| = 1$. It will suffice to consider the situations where $x\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(\ell)}$ and $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(\ell)} x$ are highest weight words, because, as we shall see, the rewriting of $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}}$ and $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}} c_x$ proceeds 'in the same way' in the general case.

7.1. Left-multiplication by transducer.

7.1.1. *A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n.* Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, and D_n and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding alphabet from $\mathcal{A}_n$, $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$, or $\mathcal{D}_n$. In these cases, the rewriting that occurs on left-multiplication by a generator is very similar, and so we treat these cases in parallel. The goal is to prove Lemma 7.2, which contains all the information we need for the eventual proof of biautomaticity.

Let $\beta^{(1)}, \ldots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible X columns, such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a tableau). Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $x\beta^{(1)} \ldots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word. Recall that $x\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(h)}$ is a highest-weight word for all $h \leq m$ by Lemma 2.3. In particular, x is a highest-weight word and so $x = 1$. The aim is to examine how the corresponding word over Σ (that is, $c_1 c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$) is rewritten by T to an irreducible word. We are going to prove that this rewriting involves a single left-to-right pass through the word, that it only changes the length of the word by at most 1, and that this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer (see Lemma 7.2).

The tabloid corresponding to $c_1 c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ has the following form:



(The symbol ? indicates that either $\preceq$ or $\not\preceq$ may hold between these columns.) First, if $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 1 (so that $r(\beta^{(1)}$ also begins with 1), then $\beta^{(1)} \preceq 1$ and so $c_1 c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ is irreducible and no rewriting takes place. So assume that $\beta^{(1)}$ does not begin with 1. Then the first symbol of $r(beta^{(1)})$ is not 1 since r replaces a symbol x with a symbol that is greater than or equal to x. Hence $\beta^{(1)} \not\preceq 1$.

Since $1\beta^{(1)}$ is a highest-weight word, we can apply some of the lemmata from Section 5 to gain information from about the first symbol of $\beta^{(1)}$:

(1) If $X = A_n$, then the first symbol of $\beta^{(1)}$ is 2 (only if $n \geq 2$) by Lemma 5.2.
(2) If $X = C_n$, then the first symbol of $\beta^{(1)}$ is 2 (only if $n \geq 2$) or $\overline{1}$ by Lemma 5.9.
(3) If $X = B_n$, then the first symbol of $\beta^{(1)}$ is 2 (only if $n \geq 2$) or 0 (only if $n = 1$) or $\overline{1}$ by Lemma 5.17.
(4) If $X = D_n$, then the first symbol of $\beta^{(1)}$ is 2 (only if $n \geq 2$) or $\overline{2}$ (only if $n = 2$) or $\overline{1}$ by Lemma 5.26.

Furthermore, the two-column lemmata tell us about $P(1\beta^{(1)})$: by Lemmata 5.4, 5.12, 5.21, and 5.34, $P(1\beta^{(1)})$ is either empty or a prefix (not necessarily proper) of $12 \cdots n$ or, only in the case $X = D_n$, of $1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$. In the latter case where $P(1\beta^{(1)})$ is non-empty, it is thus a column, and we let $\gamma^{(1)} = P(1\beta(1))$. So the corresponding rewriting begins

$$c_1 c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \to \begin{cases} c_{\gamma^{(1)}} c_{\beta^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} & \text{if } P(1\beta^{(1)}) \neq \varepsilon; \\ c_{\beta^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} & \text{if } P(1\beta^{(1)}) = \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

In the case where $P(1\beta^{(1)}) = \varepsilon$, the rewriting stops. So assume that $P(1\beta^{(1)}) \neq \varepsilon$. We now need to know about the column $\beta^{(2)}$:

Lemma 7.1. *The column $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with* 1.

Proof. If $\beta^{(2)} \preceq \gamma^{(1)}$, then since $\gamma^{(1)}$ begins with 1, so does $\beta^{(2)}$. So assume $\beta^{(2)} \not\preceq \gamma^{(1)}$.

(1) If $X = A_n$, then $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 2. Since $\beta^{(2)} \preceq \beta^{(1)}$, the column $\beta^{(2)}$ must begin with either 1 or 2. With the aim of obtaining a contradiction, suppose it begins with 2. Then $\rho_1(1\beta^{(1)}\beta^{(2)}) = +--\cdots = -\cdots$, which contradicts $x\beta^{(1)} \ldots \beta^{(m)}$ being of highest weight. Thus $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.
(2) If $X = C_n$, then $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 2 or $\overline{1}$. We consider these cases separately; each one leads to the conclusion that $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.

Suppose $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 2. Then since $\beta^{(2)} \preceq \beta^{(1)}$, the column $\beta^{(2)}$ must begin with either 1 or 2. With the aim of obtaining a contradiction, suppose it begins with 2. We get a contradiction in two different ways, depending on whether $\beta^{(1)}$ contains $\overline{2}$:

- Suppose $\beta^{(1)}$ contains $\overline{2}$. Then $\ell(\beta^{(1)})$ begins with 1 and so $\beta^{(2)}$ must begin with 1, which is a contradiction.
- Suppose $\beta^{(1)}$ does not contain $\overline{2}$. Then $\rho_1(\beta^{(1)})$ is either $-$ or $--$ (the 2 at the start contributes $-$; if there is a $\overline{1}$ at the end, it contributes another $-$). Hence $\rho_1(1\beta^{(1)}\beta^{(2)}) = +--\cdots = -\cdots$, which contradicts $x\beta^{(1)}\dots\beta^{(m)}$ being of highest weight.

Therefore $\beta^{(2)}$ must begin with 1.

Suppose $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with $\overline{1}$. Then $\beta^{(1)} = \overline{1}$ and so $P(1\beta^{(1)})$ is empty. Thus then $\beta^{(2)}\cdots\beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word that is the reading of a tableau; hence $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.

(3) If $X = B_n$, then $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 2 (only if $n \geq 2$) or 0 (only if $n = 1$) or $\overline{1}$. We consider these cases separately; each one leads to the conclusion that $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.

Suppose that $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 0. Then $n = 1$ and $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with either 1 or 0. If $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 0, then we get a contradiction, for $r(\beta^{(2)})$ begins with $\overline{1}$ (which replaces the 0) and $\ell(\beta^{(1)})$ begins with 1 (which replaces the 0), and so $r(\beta^{(2)}) \not\preceq \ell(\beta^{(1)})$, contradicting $\beta^{(2)} \preceq \beta^{(1)}$. So $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.

Suppose $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 2. Then $\beta^{(2)}$ must begin with either 1 or 2. If $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 2, the same contradictions arise as in the $X = C_n$ case. Thus $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.

Suppose $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with $\overline{1}$. By the same reasoning as in the C_n case, $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.

(4) If $X = D_n$, then $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 2 or $\overline{2}$ (only if $n = 2$) or $\overline{1}$. We consider these cases in turn; each one leads to the conclusion that $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1.

If $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with 2, then $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1 by the same reasoning as in the $X = C_n$ case. If $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with $\overline{1}$, then $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1 by the same reasoning as in the $X = C_n$ case.

The remaining case is to show that when $\beta^{(1)}$ begins with $\overline{2}$ (and so $n = 2$), then $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1. Indeed, if $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with $\overline{2}$, then $\ell(\beta^{(2)})$ begins with 1, by the definition of ℓ. Then since $r(\beta^{(2)}) \leq \ell(\beta^{(1)})$, it follows that $r(\beta^{(2)})$ begins with 1, and so $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1 by the definition of r. □

As a consequence of Lemma 7.1 and the fact that the first row of the columns $\beta^{(i)}$ must form a non-decreasing sequence since $\preceq$ holds between adjacent columns, it follows that all columns to the left of $\beta^{(2)}$ also begin with 1. That is, the tabloid corresponding to $c_1 c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ has the following

form:



In the situation we are considering, $P(1\beta^{(1)})$ is a single column $\gamma^{(1)}$, so after rewriting $c_1 c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \to c_{\gamma^{(1)}} c_{\beta^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$, the corresponding tabloid has the form



If $\beta^{(2)} \preceq \gamma^{(1)}$, then $c_{\gamma^{(1)}} c_{\beta^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ is irreducible and no further rewriting occurs. So assume $\beta^{(2)} \not\preceq \gamma^{(1)}$. Note that $\gamma^{(1)}\beta^{(2)} \dots \beta^{(m)}$ is also a highest weight word.

For $j = 2, \dots, m$, define $\hat{\beta}^{(j)}$ to be the longest contiguous prefix of $\beta^{(j)}$ containing only symbols from $\mathcal{X}[1, \dots, n-1]$. Note that because $\beta^{(j+1)} \preceq \beta^{(j)}$, each symbol of $\beta^{(j+1)}$ is less than or equal to the symbol of $\beta^{(j)}$ in the same row. Thus the prefix $\hat{\beta}^{(j+1)}$ must be at least as long as the prefix $\hat{\beta}^{(j)}$, and so $\hat{\beta}^{(j+1)} \preceq \hat{\beta}^{(j)}$. So the situation is as follows, where the horizontal lines in each column indicate the end of $\hat{\beta}^{(j)}$:



(Also note that since $\beta^{(2)} \not\preceq \gamma^{(1)}$ and $\gamma^{(1)}\beta^{(2)}$ has highest weight, it follows that $\hat{\beta}^{(2)}$ coincides with the prefix β_1 of β defined in Section 5.)

Since $\beta^{(2)}$ begins with 1, by Lemmata 5.6, 5.14, 5.23, and 5.36, $P(\gamma^{(1)}\beta^{(2)})$ has two columns, the rightmost of which is $\hat{\beta}^{(2)}$. Let $\gamma^{(2)}$ be the left column of $P(\gamma^{(1)}\beta^{(2)})$. So we have

$$c_{\gamma^{(1)}} c_{\beta^{(2)}} \dots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \to c_{\hat{\beta}^{(2)}} c_{\gamma^{(2)}} c_{\beta^{(3)}} \dots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$$

Similarly, if $\beta^{(3)} \preceq \gamma^{(2)}$, the word $c_{\hat{\beta}^{(2)}} c_{\gamma^{(2)}} c_{\beta^{(3)}} \dots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ is irreducible. So suppose $\beta^{(3)} \not\preceq \gamma^{(2)}$. We claim $\gamma^{(2)}\beta^{(3)}$ is a highest weight word. This follows since $\hat{\beta}^{(2)}$ is a prefix of both $\gamma^{(2)}$ and $\beta^{(3)}$ (since it is a prefix of $\hat{\beta}^{(3)}$) and so commutes with both by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4. Thus $\gamma^{(2)}\beta^{(3)}\hat{\beta}^{(2)} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(X)} \hat{\beta}^{(2)}\gamma^{(2)}\beta^{(3)}$ and so, since highest-weight words are closed under taking prefixes, $\gamma^{(2)}\beta^{(3)}$ is highest weight. Thus, again by Lemmata

5.6, 5.14, 5.23, and 5.36, $P(\gamma^{(2)}\beta^{(3)})$ has two columns, the rightmost of which is $\hat{\beta}^{(3)}$.

Continuing in this way, we get a sequence of admissible columns $\gamma^{(2)}, \dots, \gamma^{(k)}$ for some $k \leq m$ with $\beta^{(j+1)} \not\preceq \gamma^{(j)}$ and $P(\gamma^{(j)}\beta^{(j+1)}) = \boxed{\gamma^{(j+1)}}\boxed{\hat{\beta}^{(j+1)}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k-1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & c_{\gamma^{(1)}} c_{\beta^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ \to\ & c_{\hat{\beta}^{(2)}} c_{\gamma^{(2)}} c_{\beta^{(3)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ \to\ & c_{\hat{\beta}^{(2)}} c_{\hat{\beta}^{(3)}} c_{\gamma^{(3)}} c_{\beta^{(4)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ & \vdots \\ \to\ & c_{\hat{\beta}^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\hat{\beta}^{(k)}} c_{\gamma^{(k)}} c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

where k is such that the word $c_{\hat{\beta}^{(2)}} \cdots c_{\hat{\beta}^{(k)}} c_{\gamma^{(k)}} c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ is irreducible. (Recall from above that $\beta^{(j+1)} \preceq \beta^{(j)}$.) Then $\beta^{(k+1)} \preceq \gamma^{(k)}$. The corresponding tabloid is now a tableau of the form:



Note finally that rewriting of the form (7.1) can be carried out by a transducer that stores $c_{\gamma^{(j)}}$ in its state, reads $c_{\beta^{(j+1)}}$ and, when relevant, outputs $c_{\hat{\beta}^{(j+1)}}$.

In summary, we have proven the following lemma:

Lemma 7.2. *Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, and D_n and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding alphabet from $\mathcal{A}_n$, $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$, or $\mathcal{D}_n$. Let $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible X columns, such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is an X tableau). Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $x\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word. Rewriting $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ to normal form involves a single left-to-right pass through the word, and this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer. Furthermore, the lengths of $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ and its corresponding normal form differ by at most* 1.

7.1.2. G_2. Let $\beta^{(1)}, \cdots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible G_2 columns, such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a tableau), and let $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ be such that $x\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word. Recall that $x\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(h)}$ is a highest-weight word for all $h \leq m$ by Lemma 2.3. In particular, x is a highest-weight word and so $x = 1$.

We are going to analyze how $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ rewrites to normal form. Again, the aim is to prove that this rewriting involves a single left-to-right pass through the word, which can be carried out by a transducer (see Lemma 7.3). However, we require a fairly complicated analysis of cases, shown in Table 2. In the table, every possible admissible column is listed as a possibility for $\beta^{(1)}$. In those cases where we also have to consider $\beta^{(2)}$ or $\beta^{(3)}$, there are fewer possibilities because of the restriction $\beta^{(3)} \preceq \beta^{(2)} \preceq \beta^{(1)}$. (We refer the reader to the 'Hasse diagram' of the relation $\preceq$ of G_2 columns

in Figure 3.) Most of these cases are ruled out by the requirement that $x\beta^{(1)}\beta^{(2)}\beta^{(3)}$ is of highest weight. For example, the case where $\beta^{(1)} = 2$ and $\beta^{(2)} = 2$ is impossible, because

$$\rho_1(x\beta^{(1)}\beta^{(2)}\cdots) = \overbrace{+}^{x}\overbrace{-}^{\beta^{(1)}}\overbrace{-}^{\beta^{(2)}}\cdots = -\cdots;$$

All other cases listed as 'not highest weight' in Table 2 are ruled out in the same way, by considering either ρ_1 or ρ_2.

There are thirteen remaining cases in Table 2, but we reassure the reader that many of these quickly only result in one or two rewriting steps, and in the others the rewriting behaves in a straightforward way. Let us consider each of these cases in turn.

Case 1. $\beta^{(1)} = 1$. Then $\beta^{(1)} \preceq x$ and so no rewriting occurs: the word $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ is in normal form.

Cases 2–3a. $\beta^{(1)} = 2$ and $\beta^{(2)} \in \{1, 12, 13\}$. Now, since $\beta^{(j+1)} \preceq \beta^{(j)}$ for all j, the columns $\beta^{(2)}$, …, $\beta^{(m)}$ consist of zero or more columns 1, followed by zero or more columns 13, followed by zero or more columns 12 (see Figure 3). Notice that this subsumes the three possibilities for $\beta^{(2)}$. Note that $P(x\beta^{(1)}) = \boxed{12}$, and $P(121) = \boxed{12}\boxed{1}$, and $P(1213) = \boxed{1}\boxed{1}\boxed{1}$, as can be seen from Table 1.

When there is at least one column 13, rewriting begins

$$\begin{aligned} c_1c_2c_1^pc_{13}^qc_{12}^r &\to c_{12}c_1^pc_{13}^qc_{12}^r \\ &\to^* c_1^pc_{12}c_{13}^qc_{12}^r \\ &\to \begin{cases} c_1^pc_{12}^{r+1} & \text{if } q = 0, \\ c_1^{p+3}c_{13}^{q-1}c_{12}^r & \text{if } q \geq 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In either case, the final word is in normal form since $1 \preceq 13$ and $1 \preceq 12$.

Case 4. $\beta^{(1)} = 0$ and $\beta^{(2)} = 1$. Then $P(x\beta^{(1)}) = \boxed{1}$. Since $1 \preceq 1$, the rewriting to normal form is simply

$$c_1c_0c_1c_{\beta^{(3)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \to c_1c_1c_{\beta^{(3)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}.$$

Cases 5–7. $\beta^{(1)} = 0$, $\beta^{(2)} = 2$, and $\beta^{(3)} \in \{1, 12, 13\}$. Since $\beta^{(j+1)} \preceq \beta^{(j)}$ for all j, the columns $\beta^{(3)}$, …, $\beta^{(m)}$ consist of zero or more columns 1, followed by zero or more columns 13, followed by zero or more columns 12. Since $P(1\beta^{(1)}) = \boxed{1}$ and $P(1\beta^{(2)}) = \boxed{12}$, rewriting proceeds in one of two ways, similarly to case 2. If there is a column 13 present, rewriting proceeds

$$\begin{aligned} c_1c_0c_2c_1\cdots c_1c_{13}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} &\to c_1c_2c_1\cdots c_1c_{13}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to c_{12}c_1\cdots c_1c_{13}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to^* c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}c_{13}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_1c_1c_1c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

This word is in normal form since, regardless of whether $\beta^{(k)}$ is 12 or 13, we have $1 \preceq \beta^{(k)}$. When there is no column 13, the columns 1 are followed

TABLE 2. Cases for left-multiplication in G_2

$x = 1$	$\beta^{(1)} = 1$	Case 1	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 2$	$\beta^{(2)} = 1$	Case 2
		$\beta^{(2)} = 2$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)
		$\beta^{(2)} = 12$	Case 3
		$\beta^{(2)} = 13$	Case 3a
		$\beta^{(2)} = 23$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)
		$\beta^{(2)} = 20$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)
		$\beta^{(2)} = 2\overline{3}$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)
	$\beta^{(1)} = 3$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 0$	$\beta^{(2)} = 1$	Case 4
		$\beta^{(2)} = 2$	$\beta^{(3)} = 1$ Case 5
			$\beta^{(3)} = 2$ Not highest weight (ρ_1)
			$\beta^{(3)} = 12$ Case 6
			$\beta^{(3)} = 13$ Case 7
			$\beta^{(3)} = 23$ Not highest weight (ρ_1)
			$\beta^{(3)} = 20$ Not highest weight (ρ_1)
		$\beta^{(2)} = 3$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)
		$\beta^{(2)} = 12$	Case 8
		$\beta^{(2)} = 13$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)
		$\beta^{(2)} = 23$	Case 9
		$\beta^{(2)} = 20$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)
	$\beta^{(1)} = \overline{3}$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = \overline{2}$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = \overline{1}$	Case 10	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 12$	Case 11	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 13$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 23$	Case 12	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 00$	Case 13	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 20$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 2\overline{3}$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 0\overline{3}$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 3\overline{3}$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 30$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 3\overline{2}$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = 0\overline{2}$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = \overline{32}$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = \overline{31}$	Not highest weight (ρ_1)	
	$\beta^{(1)} = \overline{21}$	Not highest weight (ρ_2)	

immediately by columns 12, and so rewriting begins

$$\begin{aligned} c_1c_0c_2c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} &\to c_1c_2c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to c_{12}c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to^* c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}c_{12}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}, \end{aligned}$$

whichs is in normal form.

Case 8. $\beta^{(1)} = 0$ and $\beta^{(2)} = 12$. Then $P(x\beta^{(1)}) = \boxed{1}$. Since $12 \preceq 1$, the rewriting to normal form is simply

$$c_1c_0c_{12}c_{\beta^{(3)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \to c_1c_{12}c_{\beta^{(3)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}.$$

Case 9. $\beta^{(1)} = 0$ and $\beta^{(2)} = 23$. Now, since $\beta^{(j+1)} \preceq \beta^{(j)}$ for all j, the remaining columns $\beta^{(3)}, \ldots, \beta^{(m)}$ consist of zero or more columns 23, zero or more columns 13, and zero or more columns 12. Note that $P(x\beta^{(1)}) = \boxed{1}$, and $P(1\beta^{(2)}) = \boxed{1}\boxed{1}$, as can be seen from Table 1. So rewriting proceeds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1c_0c_{23}c_{23}\cdots c_{23}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} &\to c_1c_{23}c_{23}\cdots c_{23}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to c_1c_1c_{23}\cdots c_{23}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to^* c_1c_1c_1\cdots c_1c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Regardless of whether $\beta^{(k)}$ is 13 or 12, we have $\beta^{(k)} \preceq 1$, so this word is in normal form. Note that there is exactly one symbol c_1 in the final word for each symbol c_{23} in the initial word.

Case 10. $\beta^{(1)} = \overline{1}$. Since $P(1\overline{1}) = \varepsilon$, as can be seen from Table 1, the rewriting to normal form is simply

$$c_1c_{\overline{1}}c_{\beta^{(3)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \to c_{\beta^{(3)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}.$$

Case 11. $\beta^{(1)} = 12$. Since $12 \preceq 1$, the word $c_1c_{12}c_{\beta^{(2)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ is in normal form.

Case 12. $\beta^{(1)} = 23$. Since $\beta^{(j+1)} \preceq \beta^{(j)}$ for all j, the remaining columns $\beta^{(2)}, \ldots, \beta^{(m)}$ consist of zero or more columns 23, zero or more columns 13, and zero or more columns 12. Note that $P(x\beta^{(1)}) = \boxed{1}\boxed{1}$, as can be seen from Table 1. So rewriting proceeds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1c_{23}c_{23}\cdots c_{23}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} &\to c_1c_1c_{23}\cdots c_{23}c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ &\to^* c_1c_1c_1\cdots c_1c_{\beta^{(k)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Regardless of whether $\beta^{(k)}$ is 13 or 12, we have $\beta^{(k)} \preceq 1$, so this word is in normal form.

Case 13. $\beta^{(1)} = 00$. Since $\beta^{(2)} \preceq \beta^{(1)}$, it follows that $\beta^{(2)}$ is either 13 or 12 (note that $00 \not\preceq 00$). Since $P(x\beta^{(1)}) = \boxed{1}$, as can be seen from Table 1, the rewriting to normal form is simply

$$c_1c_{00}c_{\beta^{(2)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \to c_1c_{\beta^{(2)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}.$$

Regardless of whether $\beta^{(2)}$ is 13 or 12, we have $\beta^{(2)} \preceq 1$, so this word is in normal form.

This completes the case analysis. Note that in each case, the lengths of $c_xc_{\beta^{(1)}}\cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ and its corresponding normal form differ by at most 2. (The

maximum difference 2 occurs in cases 5–7 and 10.) In summary, we have proven the following lemma.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\beta^{(1)}, \cdots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible G_2 columns, such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a tableau), and let $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ be such that $x\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word. Rewriting $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ to normal form involves a single left-to-right pass through the word, and this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer. Furthermore, the lengths of $c_x c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}$ and its corresponding normal form differ by at most 2.*

7.2. **Right-multiplication by transducer.** We now turn our attention to right-multiplication. Unlike left-multiplication, the cases A_n, B_n, C_n, and D_n are sufficiently different that we have to consider them separately.

7.2.1. A_n. Let $\beta^{(1)}, \ldots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible A_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{A}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is an A_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. We are going to examine how the corresponding word over Σ (that is, $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$) rewrites to an irreducible word. The aim is to prove that this rewriting involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, which can be carried out by a transducer (see Lemma 7.5).

First, note that since the prefix $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word by Lemma 2.3, each column $\beta^{(i)}$ is of the form $1 \cdots p_i$ for some $p_i \in \mathcal{A}[1, n]$ and $p_{i+1} \geq p_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ by Lemma 4.2. That is, the tabloid corresponding to the word $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x$ is of the form:



The assumption that $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x$ is of highest weight puts a restriction on x, as the following lemma shows:

Lemma 7.4. *Either $x = 1$, or $x = p_k + 1$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $p_k < n$.*

This lemma, and its proof, essentially parallel and strengthen Lemma 5.2.

Proof. Suppose that $x \neq 1$ and $x \neq p_k + 1$ for all k. Then for each i, either $\rho_{x-1}(\beta^{(k)}) = \varepsilon$ (when $x - 1 > p_k$) or $\rho_{x-1}(\beta^{(k)}) = +- = \varepsilon$ (when $x - 1 < p_k$), and so $\rho_{x-1}(\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x) = -$, contracting the assumption of highest weight. □

We consider the cases $x = p_k + 1$ and $x = 1$ separately.

First, suppose $x = p_k + 1$, and assume that k is maximal with this property. Then for $j > k$, the symbol x appears in $\beta^{(j)}$ and so by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4, $P(\boxed{x}\boxed{\beta^{(j)}}) = \boxed{\beta^{(j)}}\boxed{x}$, while $P(\boxed{x}\boxed{\beta^{(k)}}) = \boxed{\beta^{(k)} x}$. Thus in the case $k = 6$, the column x commutes past the columns $\beta^{(9)}$, $\beta^{(8)}$, and

$\beta^{(7)}$, resulting in a tabloid of the following form:



The final rewriting step appends x to the bottom of the column $\beta^{(6)}$, giving a tableau of the following form:



So the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m-1)}} c_x c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ & \vdots \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k)}} c_x c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k)}x} c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the other case, when $x = 1$. Define k to be maximal such that $\beta^{(k)} = 1$. Then $x \not\preceq \beta^{(j)}$ and $P(\boxed{x}\boxed{\beta^{(j)}}) = \boxed{\beta^{(j)}}\boxed{x}$ for all $j > k$, and $x \preceq \beta^{(k)}$ so the resulting tableau (with $k = 2$) is of the form



and the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m-1)}} c_x c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ & \vdots \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k)}} c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} c_x c_{\beta^{(k+2)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k)}} c_x c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in both cases the length of the normal form word differs from m by at most 1. In summary, we have proved the following lemma:

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\beta^{(1)}, \ldots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible A_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{A}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is an A_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \ldots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. Rewriting*

$c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ to normal form involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, and this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer. Furthermore, the lengths of $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ and its corresponding normal form differ by at most 1.

7.2.2. C_n. Let $\beta^{(1)}, \ldots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible C_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{C}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a C_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \ldots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. As we did for type A_n, we are going to examine how the corresponding word over Σ (that is, $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$) rewrites to an irreducible word. Again, the aim is to prove that this rewriting involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, which can be carried out by a transducer (see Lemma 7.7).

Since $\beta^{(1)} \ldots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word by Lemma 2.3, each column $\beta^{(i)}$ is of the form $1 \cdots p_i$ for some $p_i \in \mathcal{C}[1, n]$, and $p_{i+1} \geq p_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ by Lemma 4.2.

The reasoning will proceed in a similar way to the A_n case, except that there is the additional possibility that x may be $\overline{p_k}$, as shown in the following lemma:

Lemma 7.6. *Either $x = 1$, or $x = p_k + 1$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $p_k < n$, or $x = \overline{p_k}$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \neq 1$ and $x \neq p_k + 1$ and $x \neq \overline{p_k}$ for all k. If $x \in \mathcal{C}[1, n]$, then the same contradiction arises as in the proof of Lemma 7.4. If $x \in \mathcal{C}[\overline{n}, \overline{1}]$, then for each k, either $\rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta^{(k)}) = \varepsilon$ (when $\overline{x} > p_k$) or $\rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta^{(k)}) = +- = \varepsilon$ (when $\overline{x} < p_k$), and so $\rho_{\overline{x}}(\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x) = -$, contradicting the assumption of highest weight. □

If $x = 1$ or $x = p_k + 1$, then the rewriting proceeds in the same way as in the A_n case. So suppose $x = \overline{p_k}$. If $p_k > 1$, we will assume that k is minimal with this property; if $p_k = 1$, we will assume that k is maximal with this property.

Now, $P(\boxed{\overline{p_k}}\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}) = \boxed{1 \cdots (p_k - 1)(p_k + 1) \cdots p_m}$, since $\beta^{(m)} \overline{p_k} =_{\mathcal{R}_5^{C_n}} 1 \cdots (p_k - 1)(p_k + 1) \cdots p_m$. Pictorially (using $k = 6$ as an example), we have:



Now, for $m > j > k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta^{(j)} 1 \cdots (p_k - 1)(p_k + 1) \cdots p_{j+1} \\
&= \underbrace{1 \cdots p_j}\, \underbrace{1 \cdots (p_k - 1)(p_k + 1) \cdots p_j}\, (p_j + 1) \cdots p_{j+1} \\
&\qquad \text{[by the Commuting columns lemma 4.4]} \\
&=_{\mathrm{Pl}(C_n)} \overbrace{1 \cdots (p_k - 1)(p_k + 1) \cdots p_j}\, \overbrace{1 \cdots p_j}\, (p_j + 1) \cdots p_{j+1} \\
&= 1 \cdots (p_k - 1)(p_k + 1) \cdots p_j \beta^{(j+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Write $\hat{\beta}^{(j)}$ for $\beta^{(j)}$ with the symbol p_k deleted. Then we have $P(\boxed{\hat{\beta}^{(j+1)}}\boxed{\beta^{(j)}}) = \boxed{\beta^{(j+1)}}\boxed{\hat{\beta}^{(j)}}$ for all $j = k+1, \ldots, m-1$. (Note that when $p_k = 1$, we know from the maximality of k that $\beta^{(j)} \neq 1$.)

Pictorially, with $k = 6$,



Essentially, the 'gap' in the columns moves from left to right through the tableau. The rewriting continues until the 'gap' reaches the column $\beta^{(k)}$. When $p_k \neq 1$, we have $P(\boxed{\hat{\beta}^{(k+1)}}\boxed{\beta^{(k)}}) = \boxed{\beta^{(k+1)}}\boxed{\hat{\beta}^{(k)}}$, where $\hat{\beta}^{(k)} = 1 \cdots (p_k - 1)$. Thus $\hat{\beta}^{(k)} \preceq \beta^{(k-1)}$ since by the minimality of k we have $p_{k-1} < p_k$. That is, pictorially:



and the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_{\overline{p_k}} \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m-1)}} c_{\hat{\beta}^{(m)}} \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\hat{\beta}^{(m-1)}} c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ & \vdots \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k-1)}} c_{\hat{\beta}^{(k)}} c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

When $p_k = 1$, we have $\hat{\beta}^{(k+1)} = 2 \cdots p_{k+1}$ (and we know $p_{k+1} > 1$ by the maximality of k) and so $P(\boxed{\hat{\beta}^{(k+1)}}\boxed{\beta^{(k)}}) = \boxed{\beta^{(k+1)}}$. That is, pictorially, with $k = 2$:



and the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_{\overline{p_k}} \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m-1)}} c_{\hat{\beta}^{(m)}} \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\hat{\beta}^{(m-1)}} c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ & \vdots \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k-1)}} c_{\beta^{(k)}} c_{\hat{\beta}^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} \\ \to\ & c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(k-1)}} c_{\beta^{(k+1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in each case the length of the normal form word differs from m by at most 1. In summary, we have proved the following lemma:

Lemma 7.7. *Let $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible C_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{C}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a C_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. Rewriting $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ to normal form involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, and this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer. Furthermore, the lengths of $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ and its corresponding normal form differ by at most 1.*

7.2.3. B_n. Let $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible B_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{B}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a B_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \dots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. As we did for types A_n and C_n, we are going to examine how the corresponding word over Σ (that is, $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$) rewrites to an irreducible word. In fact, the analysis reduces almost entirely to the C_n case: there is only one easy extra case. Again, the aim is to prove that this rewriting involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, which can be carried out by a transducer (see Lemma 7.9).

Since $\beta^{(1)} \dots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight tableau, each column $\beta^{(i)}$ is of the form $1 \cdots p_i$ for some $p_i \in \mathcal{B}[1, n]$, and $p_{i+1} \geq p_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ by Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 7.8. *One of the following holds:*

(1) $x = 1$;
(2) $x = p_k + 1$ *for some* $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ *such that* $p_k < n$;
(3) $x = 0$ *(only if* $p_m = n$*);*
(4) $x = \overline{p_k}$ *for some* $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Proof. Suppose that $x \neq 1$, $x \neq p_k + 1$, $x \neq 0$, and $x \neq \overline{p_k}$ for all k. If $x \in \mathcal{B}_n[1, n]$, then the same contradiction arises as in the proof of Lemma 7.4. If $x \in \mathcal{B}_n[\overline{n}, \overline{1}]$, then the same contradiction arises as in the proof of Lemma 7.6.

Finally, suppose $x = 0$. If $p_m \neq n$, then $\rho_n(\beta^{(k)}) = \varepsilon$ for each k and so $\rho_n(\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} 0) = -+$, contracting the assumption of highest weight. □

If $x = 1$ or $x = p_k + 1$, then the rewriting proceeds in the same way as in the A_n case, and if $x = \overline{p_k}$, then the rewriting proceeds in the same way as the C_n case. So suppose $x = 0$. Then $p_m = n$ and so $\beta^{(m)} 0 = 1 \cdots n 0 =_{\mathcal{R}_5^{B_n}} 1 \cdots n = \beta^{(m)}$; thus $P(\boxed{0}\,\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}) = \boxed{\beta^{(m)}}$. So the corresponding rewriting is

$$c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_0 \to c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}}.$$

Note that in each case the length of the normal form word differs from m by at most 1. In summary, we have proved the following lemma:

Lemma 7.9. *Let $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible B_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{B}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a B_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. Rewriting $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ to normal form involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, and this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer. Furthermore,*

the lengths of $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ *and its corresponding normal form differ by at most* 1.

7.2.4. D_n. Let $\beta^{(1)}, \ldots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible D_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{D}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a D_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \ldots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. As for the other types, we are going to examine how the corresponding word over Σ (that is, $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$) rewrites to an irreducible word. As before, the aim is to prove that this rewriting involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, which can be carried out by a transducer (see Lemma 7.11).

Since $\beta^{(1)} \ldots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word by Lemma 2.3, each column $\beta^{(i)}$ is of the form $1 \cdots p_i$ for some $p_i \in \mathcal{D}[1, n] \cup \mathcal{D}[1, \overline{n}]$, and $p_{i+1} \geq p_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ by Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 7.10. *One of the following holds:*

(1) $x = 1$;
(2) $x = p_k + 1$ *for some* $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ *such that* $p_k < n - 1$;
(3) $x = n$ *(only if* $\beta^{(k)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$ *for some* k *or* $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$*);*
(4) $x = \overline{n}$ *(only if* $\beta^{(k)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$ *for some* k *or* $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots n$*);*
(5) $x = \overline{p_k}$ *for some* $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ *such that* $p_k \leq n - 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $x \neq 1$, $x \neq p_k + 1$, $x \neq n$, $x \neq \overline{n}$, and $x \neq \overline{p_k}$ for all k. If $x \in \mathcal{D}_n[1, n-1]$ then the same contradiction arises as in the proof of Lemma 7.4. If $x \in \mathcal{D}_n[\overline{n-1}, \overline{1}]$, then the same contradiction arises as in the proof of Lemma 7.6.

Now, suppose $x = n$. If $\beta^{(k)} \neq 1 \cdots (n-1)$ for all k and $\beta^{(m)} \neq 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$, then $\rho_n(\beta^{(j)}) = \varepsilon$ (when $\beta^{(j)} = 1 \cdots p_j$ for $p_j \leq n-2$) and $\rho_{n-1}(\beta^{(j)}) = +- = \varepsilon$ (when $\beta^{(j)} = 1 \cdots n$) and so $\rho_{n-1}(\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} n) = -$, contradicting the assumption of highest weight.

Similar reasoning shows that $x = \overline{n}$ only if $\beta^{(k)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$ for some k or $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots n$, using ρ_n to get the contradictions. □

If cases (1) and (2) of Lemma 7.10 hold, or case (3) holds with $\beta^{(k)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$ for some k, then the rewriting proceeds in the same way as in the A_n case. If case (5) holds, or case (4) holds with $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots n$, then the rewriting proceeds in the same way as the C_n case.

We thus have two remaining case: case (3) with $x = n$ and $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$, or case (4) with $x = \overline{n}$ and $\beta^{(k)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$ for some k.

Suppose $x = \overline{n}$ and $\beta^{(k)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$ for some k. The case where $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots n$ has already been covered. So, by the definition of $\preceq$, either $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$ or $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$. Consider these cases separately:

(1) $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)$. So $P(\beta^{(m)}\overline{n})$ is the single column $\beta^{(m)}\overline{n}$ and so the corresponding rewriting is

$$c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_{\overline{n}} \to c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}\overline{n}}.$$

(2) $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$. Then rewriting proceeds in the same way as in the A_n case, but with $\overline{n}$ in place of n.

Finally, suppose $x = n$ and $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots (n-1)\overline{n}$. It is easy to see that rewriting is symmetric to the case C_n where $x = \overline{n}$ and $\beta^{(m)} = 1 \cdots n$.

Note that in each case the length of the normal form word differs from m by at most 1. In summary, we have proved the following lemma:

Lemma 7.11. *Let $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible D_n columns and let $x \in \mathcal{D}_n$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a D_n tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. Rewriting $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ to normal form involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, and this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer. Furthermore, the lengths of $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ and its corresponding normal form differ by at most 1.*

7.2.5. G_2. Let $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(m)}$ be admissible G_2 columns and let $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a G_2 tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)} \dots \beta^{(m)} x$ is a highest-weight word. Since $\beta^{(1)} \dots \beta^{(m)}$ is a highest-weight word, each column $\beta^{(i)}$ is either 1 or 12 by Lemma 4.2. Notice that, by the definition of $\preceq$ for type G_2, some $\beta^{(j)}$ is 12 if and only if the leftmost column $\beta^{(m)}$ is 12, and some $\beta^{(j)}$ is 1 if and only if the rightmost column $\beta^{(1)}$ is 1. As for the other types, we are going to examine how the corresponding word over Σ (that is, $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$) rewrites to an irreducible word. As before, the aim is to prove that this rewriting involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, which can be carried out by a transducer (see Lemma 7.13).

We first prove the following lemma, which tells us about the possible cases for x and the restrictions this puts on the columns $\beta^{(j)}$. We will then consider separately the rewriting that occurs according to whether some $\beta^{(j)}$ is the column 12.

Lemma 7.12. *The generator x can be*

(1) 1*;*
(2) 2*, only if there is at least one column* 1 *among the $\beta^{(j)}$;*
(3) 3*, only if there is at least one column* 12 *among the $\beta^{(j)}$;*
(4) 0*, only if there is at least one column* 1 *among the $\beta^{(j)}$;*
(5) $\overline{3}$*, only if there are at least two columns* 1 *among the $\beta^{(j)}$;*
(6) $\overline{2}$*, only if there is at least one column* 12 *among the $\beta^{(j)}$;*
(7) $\overline{1}$*, only if there is at least one column* 1 *among the $\beta^{(j)}$.*

Proof. Note first that $\rho_1(1) = +$, $\rho_1(12) = +- = \varepsilon$, $\rho_2(1) = \varepsilon$, $\rho_2(12) = +$, so $\rho_1(\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)})$ consists of a string of symbols $+$ whose length is the number of columns 1 among the $\beta^{(j)}$, and $\rho_2(\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)})$ consists of a string of symbols $+$ whose length is the number of columns 12 among the $\beta^{(j)}$. The result now follows by considering how many symbols $+$ are required to cancel symbols $-$ in $\rho_i(x)$:

(1) Nothing to prove.
(2) Since $\rho_1(2) = -$, there must be at least one column 1 among the $\beta^{(j)}$;
(3) Since $\rho_2(3) = -$, there must be at least one column 12 among the $\beta^{(j)}$;
(4) Since $\rho_1(0) = -+$, there must be at least one column 1 among the $\beta^{(j)}$;

(5) Since $\rho_1(\overline{3}) = --$, there must be at least two columns 1 among the $\beta^{(j)}$;
(6) Since $\rho_2(\overline{2}) = -$, there must be at least one column 12 among the $\beta^{(j)}$;
(7) Since $\rho_1(\overline{1}) = -$, there must be at least one column 1 among the $\beta^{(j)}$. □

Consider first the case where there is no column 12 among the $\beta^{(j)}$. That is, $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x = 1^m x$. In this case, x can be 1, 2, 0, $\overline{3}$ (only if $m \geq 2$), or $\overline{1}$ by Lemma 7.12, and so:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline x & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{cases} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{if } x = 1; \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 2 \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{if } x = 2; \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{if } x = 0, \text{ since } P(10) = \boxed{1}; \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 2 \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{if } x = \overline{3}, \text{ since } P(1\overline{3}) = \boxed{2}; \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{if } x = \overline{1} \text{ since } P(1\overline{1}) = \varepsilon; \end{cases}$$

and the corresponding rewriting of $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(m)}} c_x$ to normal form involves a single rewriting step at the right end of the word. Note that the length of the normal form differs from m by at most 2.

Next consider the case where there is at least one column 12 among the $\beta^{(j)}$. That is, $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(m)} x = 1^h (12)^k x$, with $k \geq 1$ and $h \geq 0$. In this case, x can be 1, 2 (only if $h \geq 1$), 3, 0 (only if $h \geq 1$), $\overline{3}$ (only if $h \geq 2$), $\overline{2}$, or $\overline{1}$ (only if $h \geq 1$).

(1) $x = 1$. Then since $121 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 112$, we have $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \multicolumn{1}{c}{} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{2} \\ \cline{2-2} \end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1} \end{array}$. Thus

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 2 & \cdots & 2 \\ \cline{1-4} \end{array} \quad \overset{\not\preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq}{}$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline 2 & \cdots & 2 & \cdots & 2 \\ \cline{1-5} \end{array} \quad \overset{\preceq \ \not\preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq}{}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 2 & \cdots & 2 \\ \cline{1-4} \end{array} \quad \overset{\preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq \ \preceq}{}$$

So the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \cdots c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12} c_1 &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_1 c_{12} \\ &\vdots \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) $x = 2$. Then since $122 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 212$, we have $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{2} \\ \cline{2-2}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}$). As noted above, there is at least one column 1 present. Thus:



So the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \cdots c_1 c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12} c_2 &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_2 c_{12} \\ &\vdots \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_1 c_2 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12} \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_{12} c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

(3) $x = 3$. Then since $123 =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 110 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 11$ and $1211 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 1121 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 1112$, we have $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 3 & 1 \\ \hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{2} \\ \cline{2-2}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ and $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{2} \\ \cline{3-3}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}$.

Hence:



Thus, if we add the extra rewriting rule $c_{12}c_1c_1 \to c_1c_1c_{12}$, the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \cdots c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12} c_{12} c_3 &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12} c_1 c_1 \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_1 c_1 c_{12} \\ &\vdots \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1 c_1 c_1 c_{12} \cdots c_{12} c_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

(4) $x = 0$. Then since $120 =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 210 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 21$ and $1221 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 2121 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 2112$ and $121 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 112$, we have $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 0 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ and $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}$ and $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}$. As noted above, there is at least one column 1 present. Thus

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 0 & 1 & 1 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1 \\ \hline & 2 & 2 & & 2 \\ \cline{2-3}\cline{5-5}\end{array} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & 1 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1 \\ \hline & & 2 & & 2 \\ \cline{3-3}\cline{5-5}\end{array}$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 & 2 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1 \\ \hline 2 & & & & 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\cline{5-5}\end{array}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & & 1 \\ \hline 2 & & 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\cline{3-3}\end{array}$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1 \\ \hline 2 & & 2 & 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\cline{3-4}\end{array}$$

Thus, if we add the extra rewriting rules $c_{12}c_2c_1 \to c_2c_1c_{12}$ and $c_1c_2c_1 \to c_1c_{12}$, the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \cdots c_1c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_{12}c_0 &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_2c_1 \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_2c_1c_{12} \\ &\vdots \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_2c_1c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12} \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_{12}c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

(5) $x = \overline{3}$. Then since $12\overline{3} =_{\mathcal{R}_4^{G_2}} 21\overline{3} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 22$ and $1222 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 2122 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 2212$ and $1122 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 1212$, we have $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \overline{3} & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline\end{array}$) and $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}$ and $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 2 \\ \cline{1-2}\end{array}$. As noted above, there are

at least two columns 1 present. Thus



Thus, if we add the extra rewriting rules $c_{12}c_2c_2 \to c_2c_2c_{12}$ and $c_2c_2c_1c_1 \to c_{12}c_{12}$, the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \cdots c_1c_1c_1c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_{12}c_{\overline{3}} &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_1c_1c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_2c_2 \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_1c_1c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_2c_2c_{12} \\ &\vdots \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_1c_1c_2c_2c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12} \\ &\to c_1 \cdots c_1c_{12}c_{12}c_{12} \cdots c_{12}c_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

(6) $x = \overline{2}$. Then since $12\overline{2} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 10 =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 1$ and $121 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 112$, we have $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \overline{2} & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ and $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \cline{1-1}\end{array}$. Thus



So the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_{12}c_{\overline{2}} &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_1\\ &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_1c_{12}\\ &\vdots\\ &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_1c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

(7) $x = \overline{1}$. Then since $12\overline{1} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 1\overline{3} =_{\mathcal{R}_1^{G_2}} 2$ and $122 =_{\mathcal{R}_3^{G_2}} 212$, we have $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \overline{1} & 1\\\hline 2\\\cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|}\hline 2\\\hline\end{array}$ and $P(\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 2 & 1\\\hline 2\\\cline{1-1}\end{array}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2\\\hline 2\\\cline{1-1}\end{array}$. As noted above, there is at least one column 1 present. Thus

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \overline{1} & 1 & 1 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1\\\hline & 2 & 2 & & 2\\\cline{2-3}\cline{5-5}\end{array} =_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 2 & 1 & & & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1\\\hline & 2 & & & 2\\\cline{2-2}\cline{5-5}\end{array}$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & & & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1\\\hline 2 & & & & 2\\\cline{1-1}\cline{5-5}\end{array}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & & 1\\\hline 2 & \cdots & 2\\\cline{1-3}\end{array}$$

$$=_{\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & & 1 & 1 & 1 & & 1\\\hline 2 & \cdots & 2 & 2\\\cline{1-3}\cline{4-4}\end{array}$$

So the corresponding rewriting is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1\cdots c_1c_1c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_{12}c_{\overline{1}} &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_1c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_{12}c_2\\ &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_1c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_2c_{12}\\ &\vdots\\ &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_1c_2c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_{12}\\ &\to c_1\cdots c_1c_{12}c_{12}\cdots c_{12}c_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

In each case, the corresponding rewriting using $\mathcal{T}$, augmented by rules corresponding to:

- tabloids with shape $\square\!\square\!\square$ rewriting to tableaux with shape $\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{}\\\hline\end{array}$
- tabloids with shape $\square\!\square$ rewriting to tableaux with shape $\begin{array}{|c|}\hline\\\hline\end{array}$
- tabloids with shape $\square\!\square\!\square\!\square$ rewriting to tableaux with shape $\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{}\\\hline\end{array}$

can be computed in a single right-to-left pass. Note that in each case the length of the normal form word differs from m by at most 2. In summary, we have proved the following lemma:

Lemma 7.13. *Let $\beta^{(1)},\dots,\beta^{(m)}$ be admissible G_2 columns and let $x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ be such that $\beta^{(i+1)} \preceq \beta^{(i)}$ for $i = 1,\dots,m-1$ (that is, $\boxed{\beta^{(m)}}\cdots\boxed{\beta^{(1)}}$ is a G_2 tableau), and such that $\beta^{(1)}\cdots\beta^{(m)}x$ is a highest-weight word. Rewriting*

$c_{\beta(1)} \cdots c_{\beta(m)} c_x$ to the normal form, using $\mathcal{T}$ augmented by the additional rules above, involves a single right-to-left pass through the word, and this rewriting can be carried out by a transducer. Furthermore, the lengths of $c_{\beta(1)} \cdots c_{\beta(m)} c_x$ and its corresponding normal form differ by at most 2.

8. Building the biautomatic structure

Equipped with the lemmata from Subsections 7.1 and 7.2, we are now ready to prove biautomaticity for the plactic monoids. First, we recall the essential definitions in Subsection 8.1. We also state a result that allows us to discuss rational relations rather than synchronous rational relations, which helps avoids some technical reasoning (Proposition 8.3). In Subsection 8.2, we then proceed to build the biautomatic structures and to examine some consequences and applications of biautomaticity.

8.1. **Preliminaries.** This subsection contains the definitions and basic results from the theory of automatic and biautomatic monoids needed hereafter. For further information on automatic semigroups, see [CRRT01]. We assume familiarity with basic notions of automata and regular languages (see, for example, [HU79]) and transducers and rational relations (see, for example, [Ber79]).

Definition 8.1. Let A be an alphabet and let \$ be a new symbol not in A. Define the mapping $\delta_{\mathrm{R}} : A^* \times A^* \to ((A \cup \{\$\}) \times (A \cup \{\$\}))^*$ by

$$(u_1 \cdots u_m, v_1 \cdots v_n) \mapsto \begin{cases} (u_1, v_1) \cdots (u_m, v_n) & \text{if } m = n, \\ (u_1, v_1) \cdots (u_n, v_n)(u_{n+1}, \$) \cdots (u_m, \$) & \text{if } m > n, \\ (u_1, v_1) \cdots (u_m, v_m)(\$, v_{m+1}) \cdots (\$, v_n) & \text{if } m < n, \end{cases}$$

and the mapping $\delta_{\mathrm{L}} : A^* \times A^* \to ((A \cup \{\$\}) \times (A \cup \{\$\}))^*$ by

$$(u_1 \cdots u_m, v_1 \cdots v_n) \mapsto \begin{cases} (u_1, v_1) \cdots (u_m, v_n) & \text{if } m = n, \\ (u_1, \$) \cdots (u_{m-n}, \$)(u_{m-n+1}, v_1) \cdots (u_m, v_n) & \text{if } m > n, \\ (\$, v_1) \cdots (\$, v_{n-m})(u_1, v_{n-m+1}) \cdots (u_m, v_n) & \text{if } m < n, \end{cases}$$

where $u_i, v_i \in A$.

Definition 8.2. Let M be a monoid. Let A be a finite alphabet representing a set of generators for M and let $L \subseteq A^*$ be a regular language such that every element of M has at least one representative in L. For each $a \in A \cup \{\varepsilon\}$, define the relations

$$L_a = \{(u, v) : u, v \in L, ua =_M v\}$$
$${}_aL = \{(u, v) : u, v \in L, au =_M v\}.$$

The pair (A, L) is an *automatic structure* for M if $L_a\delta_{\mathrm{R}}$ is a regular languages over $(A \cup \{\$\}) \times (A \cup \{\$\})$ for all $a \in A \cup \{\varepsilon\}$. A monoid M is *automatic* if it admits an automatic structure with respect to some generating set.

The pair (A, L) is a *biautomatic structure* for M if $L_a\delta_{\mathrm{R}}$, ${}_aL\delta_{\mathrm{R}}$, $L_a\delta_{\mathrm{L}}$, and ${}_aL\delta_{\mathrm{L}}$ are regular languages over $(A \cup \{\$\}) \times (A \cup \{\$\})$ for all $a \in A \cup \{\varepsilon\}$. A monoid M is *biautomatic* if it admits a biautomatic structure with respect to some generating set. [Note that biautomaticity implies automaticity.]

Unlike the situation for groups, biautomaticity for monoids and semigroups, like automaticity, is dependent on the choice of generating set [CRRT01, Example 4.5]. However, for monoids, biautomaticity and automaticity are independent of the choice of *semigroup* generating sets [DRR99, Theorem 1.1].

Hoffmann & Thomas have made a careful study of biautomaticity for semigroups [HT05]. They distinguish four notions of biautomaticity for semigroups, which are all equivalent for groups and more generally for cancellative semigroups [HT05, Theorem 1] but distinct for semigroups [HT05, Remark 1 & § 4]. In the sense used in this paper, 'biautomaticity' implies *all four* of these notions of biautomaticity.

In proving that $R\delta_{\mathrm{R}}$ or $R\delta_{\mathrm{L}}$ is regular, where R is a relation on A^*, a useful strategy is to prove that R is a rational relation (that is, a relation recognized by a finite transducer [Ber79, Theorem 6.1]) and then apply the following result, which is a combination of [FS93, Corollary 2.5] and [HT05, Proposition 4]:

Proposition 8.3. *If $R \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ is rational relation and there is a constant k such that $\big||u| - |v|\big| \leq k$ for all $(u, v) \in R$, then $R\delta_{\mathrm{R}}$ and $R\delta_{\mathrm{L}}$ are regular.*

8.2. **Construction.** In Subsections 7.1 and 7.2, we studied the rewriting that occurs when a highest-weight normal form word is left- or right-multiplied by a generator. We now turn to building biautomatic structures for the plactic monoids of each type. The strategy is to show that the same kind of rewriting occurs when a normal form word, not necessarily of highest weight, is left- or right-multiplied by a generator, and thus that such rewriting can be carried out by a two-tape automaton.

Theorem 8.4. *The plactic monoids* $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$, $\mathrm{Pl}(B_n)$, $\mathrm{Pl}(C_n)$, $\mathrm{Pl}(D_n)$, *and* $\mathrm{Pl}(G_2)$ *are biautomatic.*

Proof. Let X be one of the types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, and G_2 and let $\mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding alphabet from $\mathcal{A}_n$, $\mathcal{B}_n$, $\mathcal{C}_n$, $\mathcal{D}_n$, or $\mathcal{G}_2$. Let (Σ, T) be the rewriting system constructed in Section 6.

The Kashiwara operators $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ apply to words over $\mathcal{X}$. For convenience, we will apply them to words over Σ as follows: define

$$\tilde{e}_i(c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}}) = c_{\gamma^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\gamma^{(\ell)}},$$

where $\tilde{e}_i(\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(\ell)}) = \gamma^{(1)} \cdots \gamma^{(\ell)}$ and $|\beta^{(j)}| = |\gamma^{(j)}|$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Define $\tilde{f}_i$ on Σ^* analogously. Notice that $\tilde{e}_i(\boxed{\beta^{(\ell)}} \cdots \boxed{\beta^{(1)}}) = \boxed{\gamma^{(\ell)}} \cdots \boxed{\gamma^{(1)}}$ since the Kashiwara operators preserves shapes by Lemma 4.1. We will say a word $c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}} \in \Sigma^*$ has highest weight if $\beta^{(1)} \cdots \beta^{(\ell)}$ has highest weight, or, equivalently, if $\tilde{e}_i(c_{\beta^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\beta^{(\ell)}})$ is undefined for all i.

Let L be the language of irreducible words of this rewriting system. That is

$$L = \big\{\, c_{\gamma^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\gamma^{(\ell)}} \in \Sigma^* : \gamma^{(j+1)} \preceq \gamma^{(j)} \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1 \,\big\}.$$

We are going to show that (Σ, L) is a biautomatic structure for $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$.

Let $u = c_{\gamma^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\gamma^{(\ell)}} \in L$, let $c_y \in \Sigma$ where $y \in X$, and let $v \in L$ be such that $c_{\gamma^{(1)}} \cdots c_{\gamma^{(\ell)}} c_y =_{\mathrm{Pl}(X)} v$.

Let $i_1, \ldots, i_m$ be such that $\tilde{e}_{i_m} \cdots \tilde{e}_{i_1}(c_{\beta(1)} \cdots c_{\beta(\ell)} c_y) = c_{\gamma(1)} \cdots c_{\gamma(\ell)} c_x$ is a highest weight word. By Lemmata 7.5, 7.7, 7.9, 7.11, and 7.13, there is a sequence of rewriting

$$c_{\gamma(1)} \cdots c_{\gamma(\ell)} c_x \to u_1 \to \ldots \to u_p \in L, \tag{8.1}$$

where the rewriting proceeds from right to left in a single pass. (As described in Subsubsection 7.2.5, when X is G_2 we have to add some extra rules to T to get rewriting that proceeds in a single right-to-left pass.) By Lemma 4.1, applying the composition of Kashiwara operators $\tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_m}$ to every term in the sequence (8.1) gives a sequence of rewriting

$$uc_y = c_{\beta(1)} \cdots c_{\beta(\ell)} c_y \to v_1 \to \ldots \to v_p = v \in L, \tag{8.2}$$

where the rewriting proceeds from right to left in a single pass. This rewriting can be computed by a transducer that reads from right to left and stores a short 'working' subword in its state. Since the class of rational relations are closed under reversal, L_{c_y} is a rational relation.

Let $c_\sigma \in \Sigma$. So σ is an admissible X column and $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k$ for some $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{X}$, with $k \leq n$. So

$$L_{c_\sigma} = L_{\sigma_1} \circ \cdots \circ L_{\sigma_k}. \tag{8.3}$$

Furthermore, by Lemmata 7.5, 7.7, 7.9, 7.11, and 7.13, in (8.1), we have $\big|\ell - |u_p|\big| \leq K$ for a constant K. Hence if $(u, v) \in L_{c_y}$, then $\big||u| - |v|\big| \leq K$. Thus it follows from (8.3) that if $(u, v) \in L_{c_\sigma}$, then $\big||u| - |v|\big| \leq |\sigma| K$. Hence L_{c_σ} is a synchronous rational relation by Proposition 8.3.

Similar reasoning applied to left multiplication but using Lemmata 7.2 and 7.3 shows that ${}_{c_\sigma}L$ is a synchronous rational relation. Therefore (Σ, L) is a biautomatic structure for $\mathrm{Pl}(X)$. □

Theorem 8.4 has several important corollaries. We emphasize that these are purely crystal-theoretic consequences of the biautomaticity of the plactic monoids:

Corollary 8.5. *For the crystal graphs of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, or G_2, there is a quadratic-time algorithm that takes as input two vertices and decides whether they lie in the same position in isomorphic components.*

Proof. Two vertices lie in the same position in isomorphic connected components if and only if they represent the same element of the plactic monoid of the given type. This monoid is biautomatic by Theorem 8.4, and biautomatic (and automatic) monoids have word problem soluble in quadradic time [CRRT01, Corollary 3.7]. □

Note in passing that Corollary 8.5 cannot be deduced directly from tableaux insertion algorithms except in the A_n case. Schensted's insertion algorithm (see [Lot02, Chapter 5]) can solve the word problem in $\mathrm{Pl}(A_n)$ in quadratic time because inserting a single symbol into a tableau takes linear time. However, in types B_n, C_n, and D_n inserting a single symbol into a tableau may take more that linear time (see [Lec02, § 4] and [Lec03, § 3.3]), because in certain cases a recursion arises that requires inserting an entire column symbol by symbol into the remainder of the tableau.

Corollary 8.6. *For the crystal graphs of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n, or G_2, there is a quadratic-time algorithm that takes as input two vertices and decides that whether they lie in isomorphic components.*

Proof. Let $B(u_1)$ and $B(u_2)$ be two components of the crystal graph, where u_1 and u_2 are any vertices of these components. Apply operators $\tilde{e}_i$ to transform u_1 and u_2 to highest-weight words v_1 and v_2 respectively. It is easy to see that each application of $\tilde{e}_i$ takes linear time in the length of the word. Each symbol of the word can be altered a bounded number of times by the various $\tilde{e}_i$, so computing v_1 and v_2 takes at most quadratic time in the lengths of u_1 and v_1. Then $B(u_1)$ and $B(u_2)$ are isomorphic if and only if v_1 and v_2 lie in the same position in $B(u_1)$ and $B(u_2)$, which can be decided in quadratic time by Corollary 8.5. □

References

[Ani86] D. J. Anick. 'On the homology of associative algebras'. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 296, no. 2 (1986), pp. 641–659. DOI: 10.2307/2000383.

[Bak00] T. H. Baker. 'An insertion scheme for C_n crystals'. In *Physical combinatorics (Kyoto, 1999)*, vol. 191 of *Progr. Math.*, pp. 1–48. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2000.

[Ber79] J. Berstel. *Transductions and context-free languages*, vol. 38 of *Leitfäden der Angewandten Mathematik und Mechanik [Guides to Applied Mathematics and Mechanics]*. B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1979.

[BKK00] G. Benkart, S. J. Kang, & M. Kashiwara. 'Crystal bases for the quantum superalgebra $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}(m,n))$'. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 13, no. 2 (2000), pp. 295–331. DOI: 10.1090/S0894-0347-00-00321-0.

[BN98] F. Baader & T. Nipkow. *Term rewriting and all that*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[BO93] R. V. Book & F. Otto. *String-Rewriting Systems*. Texts and Monographs in Computer Science. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.

[Bro92] K. S. Brown. 'The geometry of rewriting systems: a proof of the Anick-Groves-Squier theorem'. In *Algorithms and classification in combinatorial group theory (Berkeley, CA, 1989)*, vol. 23 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pp. 137–163. Springer, New York, 1992. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4613-9730-4_6.

[Cai09] A. J. Cain. 'Monoids presented by rewriting systems and automatic structures for their submonoids'. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 19, no. 6 (2009), pp. 771–790. DOI: 10.1142/s0218196709005317.

[CEK+01] J. Cassaigne, M. Espie, D. Krob, J. C. Novelli, & F. Hivert. 'The Chinese monoid'. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 11, no. 3 (2001), pp. 301–334. DOI: 10.1142/S0218196701000425.

[CGM15] A. J. Cain, R. D. Gray, & A. Malheiro. 'Finite Gröbner–Shirshov bases for Plactic algebras and biautomatic structures for Plactic monoids'. *J. Algebra*, 423 (2015), pp. 37–53. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2014.09.037.

[CHKT11] R. Corran, M. Hoffmann, D. Kuske, & R. M. Thomas. 'Singular Artin monoids of finite Coxeter type are automatic'. In *Language and Automata Theory and Applications*, vol. 6638 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 250–261, 2011. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-21254-3_19.

[CM15] A. J. Cain & A. Malheiro. 'Deciding conjugacy in sylvester monoids and other homogeneous monoids'. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 25, no. 5 (2015). DOI: 10.1142/S0218196715500241.

[CO04] F. Cedó & J. Okniński. 'Plactic algebras'. *J. Algebra*, 274, no. 1 (2004), pp. 97–117. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2003.12.004.

[CO12] F. Cedó & J. Okniński. 'Gröbner bases for quadratic algebras of skew type'. *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2)*, 55, no. 2 (2012), pp. 387–401. DOI: 10.1017/S0013091511000447.

[Coh97] D. E. Cohen. 'String rewriting and homology of monoids'. *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.*, 7, no. 3 (1997), pp. 207–240. DOI: 10.1017/S0960129596002149.

[CRRT01] C. M. Campbell, E. F. Robertson, N. Ruškuc, & R. M. Thomas. 'Automatic semigroups'. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 250, no. 1–2 (2001), pp. 365–391. DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3975(99)00151-6.

[Deh15a] P. Dehornoy. 'Quadratic normalisation in monoids'. *arXiv:1504.02717*, 2015.

[Deh15b] P. Dehornoy. 'Set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, RC-calculus, and Garside germs'. *Adv. Math.*, 282 (2015), pp. 93–127. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2015.05.008.

[DK94] G. Duchamp & D. Krob. 'Plactic-growth-like monoids'. In *Words, languages and combinatorics, II (Kyoto, 1992)*, pp. 124–142. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1994.

[Dri85] V. G. Drinfel'd. 'Hopf algebras and the quantum Yang-Baxter equation'. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 283, no. 5 (1985), pp. 1060–1064.

[DRR99] A. J. Duncan, E. F. Robertson, & N. Ruškuc. 'Automatic monoids and change of generators'. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 127, no. 3 (1999), pp. 403–409. DOI: 10.1017/S0305004199003722.

[ECH+92] D. B. A. Epstein, J. W. Cannon, D. F. Holt, S. V. F. Levy, M. S. Paterson, & W. P. Thurston. *Word Processing in Groups*. Jones & Bartlett, Boston, Mass., 1992.

[FS93] C. Frougny & J. Sakarovitch. 'Synchronized rational relations of finite and infinite words'. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 108, no. 1 (1993), pp. 45–82. International Colloquium on Words, Languages and Combinatorics (Kyoto, 1990). DOI: 10.1016/0304-3975(93)90230-Q.

[GJK+14] D. Grantcharov, J. H. Jung, S. J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, & M. Kim. 'Crystal bases for the quantum queer superalgebra and semistandard decomposition tableaux'. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 366, no. 1 (2014), pp. 457–489. DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9947-2013-05866-7.

[GJK+15] D. Grantcharov, J. H. Jung, S. J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, & M. Kim. 'Crystal bases for the quantum queer superalgebra'. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17, no. 7 (2015), pp. 1593–1627. DOI: 10.4171/JEMS/540.

[Gre07] J. A. Green. *Polynomial representations of* GL_n, vol. 830 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, augmented edition, 2007. With an appendix on Schensted correspondence and Littelmann paths by K. Erdmann, Green and M. Schocker.

[Gri95] P. A. Grillet. *Semigroups: An Introduction to the Structure Theory*, vol. 193 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1995.

[Gro87] M. Gromov. 'Hyperbolic groups'. In S. M. Gersten, ed., *Essays in group theory*, vol. 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pp. 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.

[GS90] S. M. Gersten & H. B. Short. 'Small cancellation theory and automatic groups'. *Invent. Math.*, 102, no. 2 (1990), pp. 305–334. DOI: 10.1007/BF01233430.

[Hag15] N. Hage. 'Finite convergent presentation for the plactic monoid for type C'. *Int. J. Algebra Comput*, 2015. Forthcoming. arXiv: 1412.0539.

[Hig92] P. M. Higgins. *Techniques of Semigroup Theory*. Oxford Science Publications. Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992.

[HK02] J. Hong & S. J. Kang. *Introduction to quantum groups and crystal bases*, vol. 42 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/042.

[HR12] D. F. Holt & S. Rees. 'Artin groups of large type are shortlex automatic with regular geodesics'. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 104, no. 3 (2012), pp. 486–512. DOI: 10.1112/plms/pdr035.

[HT05] M. Hoffmann & R. M. Thomas. 'Biautomatic semigroups'. In *Fundamentals of computation theory*, vol. 3623 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pp. 56–67. Springer, Berlin, 2005. DOI: 10.1007/11537311_6.

[HU79] J. E. Hopcroft & J. D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*. Addison–Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1979.

[Jim85] M. Jimbo. 'A q-difference analogue of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and the Yang-Baxter equation'. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 10, no. 1 (1985), pp. 63–69. DOI: 10.1007/BF00704588.

[JOVC15] E. Jespers, J. Okniński, & M. Van Campenhout. 'Finitely generated algebras defined by homogeneous quadratic monomial relations and their underlying monoids'. *J. Algebra*, 440 (2015), pp. 72–99. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2015.05.017.

[Kan03] S. J. Kang. 'Crystal bases for quantum affine algebras and combinatorics of Young walls'. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 86, no. 1 (2003), pp. 29–69. DOI: 10.1112/S0024611502013734.

[Kas90] M. Kashiwara. 'Crystalizing the q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras'. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 133, no. 2 (1990), pp. 249–260. URL: `http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.cmp/1104201397`.

[Kas91] M. Kashiwara. 'On crystal bases of the Q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras'. *Duke Math. J.*, 63, no. 2 (1991), pp. 465–516. DOI: 10.1215/S0012-7094-91-06321-0.

[Kas95] M. Kashiwara. 'On crystal bases'. In *Representations of groups (Banff, AB, 1994)*, vol. 16 of *CMS Conf. Proc.*, pp. 155–197. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995.

[KM94] S. J. Kang & K. C. Misra. 'Crystal bases and tensor product decompositions of $U_q(G_2)$-modules'. *J. Algebra*, 163, no. 3 (1994), pp. 675–691. DOI: 10.1006/jabr.1994.1037.

[KN94] M. Kashiwara & T. Nakashima. 'Crystal graphs for representations of the q-analogue of classical Lie algebras'. *J. Algebra*, 165, no. 2 (1994), pp. 295–345. DOI: 10.1006/jabr.1994.1114.

[Knu70] D. E. Knuth. 'Permutations, matrices, and generalized Young tableaux'. *Pacific J. Math.*, 34 (1970), pp. 709–727. URL: `projecteuclid.org/euclid.pjm/1102971948`.

[KO12] Ł. Kubat & J. Okniński. 'Plactic algebra of rank 3'. *Semigroup Forum*, 84, no. 2 (2012), pp. 241–266.

[KO15] Ł. Kubat & J. Okniński. 'Identities of the plactic monoid'. *Semigroup Forum*, 90, no. 1 (2015), pp. 100–112. DOI: 10.1007/s00233-014-9609-9.

[KT97] D. Krob & J. Y. Thibon. 'Noncommutative symmetric functions. IV. Quantum linear groups and Hecke algebras at $q = 0$'. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 6, no. 4 (1997), pp. 339–376. DOI: 10.1023/A:1008673127310.

[Lec02] C. Lecouvey. 'Schensted-type correspondence, plactic monoid, and jeu de taquin for type C_n'. *J. Algebra*, 247, no. 2 (2002), pp. 295–331. DOI: 10.1006/jabr.2001.8905.

[Lec03] C. Lecouvey. 'Schensted-type correspondences and plactic monoids for types B_n and D_n'. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 18, no. 2 (2003), pp. 99–133. DOI: 10.1023/A:1025154930381.

[Lec07] C. Lecouvey. 'Combinatorics of crystal graphs for the root systems of types A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n and G_2'. In *Combinatorial aspect of integrable systems*, vol. 17 of *Mathematical Society of Japan Memoirs*, pp. 11–41. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2007. DOI: doi:10.2969/msjmemoirs/01701C020.

[Lec09] C. Lecouvey. 'Crystal bases and combinatorics of infinite rank quantum groups'. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361, no. 1 (2009), pp. 297–329. DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9947-08-04480-2.

[Lit95] P. Littelmann. 'Crystal graphs and Young tableaux'. *J. Algebra*, 175, no. 1 (1995), pp. 65–87. DOI: 10.1006/jabr.1995.1175.

[Lit96] P. Littelmann. 'A plactic algebra for semisimple Lie algebras'. *Adv. Math.*, 124, no. 2 (1996), pp. 312–331. DOI: 10.1006/aima.1996.0085.

[Loh05] M. Lohrey. 'Decidability and complexity in automatic monoids'. *Internat. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 16, no. 4 (2005), pp. 707–722. DOI: 10.1142/S0129054105003248.

[Lot02] M. Lothaire. *Algebraic combinatorics on words*, vol. 90 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[LS78] A. Lascoux & M. P. Schützenberger. 'Sur une conjecture de H. O. Foulkes'. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 286, no. 7 (1978), pp. A323–A324.

[LS81] A. Lascoux & M. P. Schützenberger. 'Le monoïde plaxique'. In *Noncommutative structures in algebra and geometric combinatorics (Naples, 1978)*, vol. 109 of *Quad. "Ricerca Sci."*, pp. 129–156. CNR, Rome, 1981.

[LS85] A. Lascoux & M. P. Schützenberger. 'Schubert polynomials and the Littlewood-Richardson rule'. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 10, no. 2-3 (1985), pp. 111–124. DOI: 10.1007/BF00398147.

[LS90] A. Lascoux & M. P. Schützenberger. 'Noncommutative schubert polynomials'. *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, , no. 23 (1990), pp. 223–225.

[Okn14] J. Okniński. 'On the semiprimitivity of finitely generated algebras'. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142, no. 12 (2014), pp. 4095–4098. DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9939-2014-12187-3.

[OR01] F. Otto & N. Ruškuc. 'Confluent monadic string-rewriting systems and automatic structures'. *J. Autom. Lang. Comb.*, 6, no. 3 (2001), pp. 375–388.

[OSKM98] F. Otto, A. Sattler-Klein, & K. Madlener. 'Automatic monoids versus monoids with finite convergent presentations'. In *Rewriting techniques and applications (Tsukuba, 1998)*, vol. 1379 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pp. 32–46. Springer, Berlin, 1998. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0052359.

[Ott00] F. Otto. 'On Dehn functions of finitely presented bi-automatic monoids'. *J. Autom. Lang. Comb.*, 5, no. 4 (2000), pp. 405–419.

[Pic06] M. Picantin. 'Finite transducers for divisibility monoids'. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 362, no. 1-3 (2006), pp. 207–221. DOI: 10.1016/j.tcs.2006.06.019.

[Rušˇ95] N. Ruškuc. *Semigroup Presentations*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of St Andrews, 1995. URL: `hdl.handle.net/10023/2821`.

[Sch61] C. Schensted. 'Longest increasing and decreasing subsequences'. *Canad. J. Math.*, 13 (1961), pp. 179–191. DOI: 10.4153/CJM-1961-015-3.

[Sch77] M. P. Schützenberger. 'La correspondance de Robinson'. In *Combinatoire et représentation du groupe symétrique (Actes Table Ronde CNRS, Univ. Louis-Pasteur Strasbourg, Strasbourg, 1976)*, pp. 59–113. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 579. Springer, Berlin, 1977.

[Sch97] M. P. Schützenberger. 'Pour le monoïde plaxique'. *Math. Inform. Sci. Humaines*, , no. 140 (1997), pp. 5–10. URL: `www.ehess.fr/revue-msh/pdf/N140R764.pdf`.

[Ser10] L. Serrano. 'The shifted plactic monoid'. *Math. Z.*, 266, no. 2 (2010), pp. 363–392. DOI: 10.1007/s00209-009-0573-0.

[SOK94] C. C. Squier, F. Otto, & Y. Kobayashi. 'A finiteness condition for rewriting systems'. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 131, no. 2 (1994), pp. 271–294. DOI: 10.1016/0304-3975(94)90175-9.

[Sta99] R. P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Vol. 2*, vol. 62 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511609589.

[Ste03] J. R. Stembridge. 'A local characterization of simply-laced crystals'. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355, no. 12 (2003), pp. 4807–4823 (electronic). DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9947-03-03042-3.

[Tho74] G. P. Thomas. 'Baxter algebras and schur functions', 1974.

[Tho78] G. P. Thomas. 'On Schensted's construction and the multiplication of Schur functions'. *Adv. in Math.*, 30, no. 1 (1978), pp. 8–32. DOI: 10.1016/0001-8708(78)90129-9.

[Ufn98] V. Ufnarovski. 'Introduction to noncommutative Gröbner bases theory'. In *Gröbner bases and applications (Linz, 1998)*, vol. 251 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pp. 259–280. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511565847.015.

[vL01] M. A. A. van Leeuwen. 'The Littlewood-Richardson rule, and related combinatorics'. In *Interaction of combinatorics and representation theory*, vol. 11 of *MSJ Mem.*, pp. 95–145. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2001.

Centro de Matemática e Aplicações, Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2829–516 Caparica, Portugal
E-mail address: a.cain@fct.unl.pt

School of Mathematics, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom
E-mail address: Robert.D.Gray@uea.ac.uk

Centro de Matemática e Aplicações, Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2829–516 Caparica, Portugal

Centro de Álgebra da Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Prof. Gama Pinto 2, 1649–003 Lisboa, Portugal,
E-mail address: ajm@fct.unl.pt